

TRUTH AND INNOCENCY Defended,

Being a Sober Reply, to some Excesses, in
a Treatise, written by JOHN NORRIS,
concerning the Divine Light: Wherein his
Personal Reflections and Misrepresentations of
the Quakers about their Principle of the Light,
are further considered.

By RICHARD VICKRIS.

*Let not the Wise man glory in his Wisdom, &c. But let him
that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and know-
eth me that I am the Lord; which exercise Loving-kindness,
Judgment and Righteousness in the Earth, for in these
things I delight, saith the Lord, Jer. 9. 23, 24.*

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by T. Some at the Crooked-Billet, in Holywell-
Lane, in Shoreditch, in the Year 1693.

G. Ramph. 2828.9.



U S I

66611

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the County of ... for the year 1900:

218701N 091111Z

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1861. It is a very important document, as it is the first official communication of the new President to the Congress. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains a great deal of information about the President's views on the issues of the day. The letter is a very important document, as it is the first official communication of the new President to the Congress. The letter is written in a very formal and dignified style, and it contains a great deal of information about the President's views on the issues of the day.

The EPISTLE to the READER.

Friendly Reader,

THERE is nothing so desirable as Peace and Concord: I know the very name of Controversie sounds harsh in the Ears of many sober People, besides my self, and those whose Cause I am vindicating: But so farasmuch as it is become the subject of the ensuing Treatise, I judge it convenient to acquaint thee, that whatever Motives my Adversary had in giving the occasion, it is not for the sake of Controversie nor any worldly Interest or advantage sought by me; but singly for Truth and Innocencies sake, that I thus appear, in defence of both, from gross misrepresentation, and a very ill Character; wherein my Adversary has exceeded to that degree, as if he designed by that means to make his words good, *viz.* That I should have occasion to with I had never put him upon this undertaking; for I seriously profess, that laying aside the Abuses and Insults of his Book, I see no occasion for such a conjecture: If Truth and Righteousness had been his Basis; Sobriety and Temperance would have been his Ornament; but this being wanting his Argument proves fallacious, and his Treatment uncivil, and Injurious: which excited that degree of aversion in me, that I was ready at first to conclude, to bear his Reproaches with silence: But the consideration of the Truth I profess as being exposed by his gross misrepresentation and calumny, obliged me to this further concern: My design herein being to undeceive, and give a better and truer information of the *Quakers* Principle, of the Divine Light, to the sober minded, and honest enquirer, then *J. N.* hath done; wherein I have aimed at something more than Controversie, *viz.* such an Illustration of the Principle of Divine Light, as may be useful and serviceable to most Capacities; as concurring with Scripture-Language, and confirmed with its divine Testimony: And though I have not given it the Title of such a Treatise; I hope it will be found not less deserving it, than my Adversaries.

The Epistle to the Reader.

I shall now (apprehending it in some sort necessary) acquaint thee with the occasion hereof, *J. N.* writes a Book, entituled, *Reflections on the Conduct of Human Life, &c.* which Title carried the face of something worthy of enquiry and search, and to do him Justice, there are many excellent expressions and undeniable Truths in it; And although divine Experience and enjoyment is of much more value with the *Quakers*, then the finest Speculation, or Notion; yet many were pleased with the subject, especially considering from whence it came, because they look upon it as tending to promote the Principle of Divine Light; which according to the *Quakers*, is not only perfective of the understanding, but is that Grace of God that brings Salvation, and hath appeared unto all men, teaching to deny Ungodliness and worldly Lusts, and to live Godly, Righteously and Soberly in this present evil world; whereby the Soul comes to experience Redemption throughly; not only to have the understanding enlightened, but the will and affections Rectified, and purified.

Thus the *Quakers*, Rejoycing in the Truth, was ready and willing to believe *J. N.* intended the same thing by his Notion of the Light, and for the sake thereof, would have born his unkind Reflection on them, had he stopt there: But how it came to pass I know not, after he had said positively, *This is Truth, this is that Light within, so darkly talkt of by some, who have by their Auckward, untoward and unprincipled way of representing it, discredited one of the noblest Theories in the world; but the thing in it self rightly understood is true, and if any shall yet call it Quakerism, or Enthusiasm, it is such Quakerism as makes up a good part of St. John's Gospel, and St. Austin's Works: Reflect. on the Cond. &c. pag. (77.)* After this *J. N.* puts forth in his second Edition, an Additional Postscript, in which, whether from an Emulation of the *Quakers* Claim to the Principle he asserted; Jealousie of being esteemed a Proselyte; thame of his Brethrens Reproaches, fear of loss of preferment, or affectation of Novelty; I dare not determine; but sure I am, he hath greatly misrepresented the *Quakers* belief, and doctrine of the Light within, offering instead of their words, and sence, the Conjectures and Imaginations of his own Brain; for which unfair dealing I was concerned to reprehend him; which I did in a little Book, entituled, *A Just Reprehension to J. N. for his unjust Reflections on the Quakers;* But my

The Epistle to the Reader.

my plain dealing therein, and manner of address, not being attended with the usual Complements; was so ill resented by him, that he Indited me for Rusticity, and Rendred me below the breeding even of a Water-man; for want (as he pretends) of fair and civil Language; but in Truth it is for want of Courtliness of stile, and behaviour; wherein I perceive he apprehends my Treatment of him was defective: That *J. N.* Master of Arts, Late Rector of *Newton St. Loe*, near *Bath*; and newly advanced to *Bermerton* near *Salum*; Late fellow of *All Souls Colledge* in *Oxford*; a man of Refined Notions, one that has undertaken to Reflect on the Conduct of those of his own Order, as being able to discover such profitable Truths, as they after all their study were Ignorant of, should be Reprehended by a Quaker; *A Man of that sullen tribe, whose visible Mark and Character is Rusticity*, as he says, *pag. 2.* Is with him such an Intollerable piece of Rudeness as cannot be born, without rendring him an affronting and provoking Adversary. Therefore to purge himself from dissingenuity, Misrepresentation, and ill Character of the Quakers, and their Principle, as also contradiction and error, as signed against him, He writes another Book, called, *Two Treatises concerning the Divine Light*; The first being an Answer, as he saith, to a Letter of a Learned Quaker, &c. And contains an Explanation of his former Misrepresentation of the Quakers principle of the Light within; with divers quotations out of some of their Authors; with design to make good his Charges; but instead thereof, he hath made his matter much worse than before; for being short and wanting of proof, he hath laid the whole stress of his Charges, both new and old, upon most unjust and partial Inferences, and unfair and undue Consequences, contrary to the very express words and sence of the Authors he quotes; which has been the occasion of this undertaking, and sober Reply; not only to vindicate the cause of my Just Reprehension, but to detect, and shew how these Absurdities, Self-contradictions, and Inconsistancies, he would be thought to have fastened on the Quakers, return upon himself as may appear by the sequel; wherein I have also examined *J. N.*'s new Invention, or Notion, of making that Light, by which he sees, and knows; that the whole is more than a part, and that 15 and 5 make 20, to be the *Divine Logos*, and the very Substance and Essence of the Deity strictly speaking; and

and yet makes it not to be Grace, simply and absolutely as to its whole nature and kind, but only with respect to some degrees of it and those undiscovered. I further shew that while he pretends his

Page 45.
and 46. Light to be Grace, as to certain degrees of it; He opposes it to that special and peculiar Grace of Christ, whereby

he restores Laps'd man from the Corruption of his Natural state: That the Consequence of this is that he makes his Light not to be Christ; for Christ is Grace in his whole Nature and kind, full of Grace and full of Truth; and if not Christ, then not the Divine Logos, for they are one, consequently his Light can be no other; but mans natural Light, (as they call it) or the remaining Light of Creation, or Rational Spirit; and the Divine Logos usurpt for it.

This new started Notion of this Clergy-man, with his extravagant abuses of the Quakers, and their principle of the Divine Light, which he hath joyned with it, have been the subject of discourse for some time; who being Reprehended for it, hath stretched forth his Hand, and set his Wits and Pen at work against the Truth of God; as Revealed to, and believed by the People called Quakers, as many before him hath done, whom God hath Rebuked; and whose wisdom he hath confounded and brought to nought; and hath cleared his Truth in the faces of his Enemies, from the many gross Calumnies of our Day; And caused his Divine Light to shine out of darkness, and to shine in the Hearts of many Thousands, to give them the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus, &c. which was before these pretended Philosophical Notions had a being, and will be when they shall have no place.

One might Reasonably think *J. N.* is strangely metamorphized, since he wrote his Reflections on the Conduct of Human Life, with respect to the study of Learning and Knowledge, in which he shews the vanity of the common way of Scholastick disputation, *viz.* Raising of Sillogisms upon Ambiguous and mistaken Propositions, which he calls meer quibbling, and so indeed it is, and the whole procedure to be rejected as Idle, and Impertinent: But *J. N.* undertaking to maintain his Injurious Charges, and Imputations of Absurdity, and Contradiction, on the Quakers; and wanting proof, hath been put to his shifts, and reduced to fly to that for help, he had so lately, and loudly decryed, *viz.* Forming Sophistical Sillogisms, and

The Epistle to the Reader.

and drawing positive Conclusions not barely from Ambiguous; but from presumptive and false Premises; and all to fasten Absurdity on the Quakers; as in his Appendix, pag. 13. where *J. N.* quoting divers passages out of *R. B.* and *G. K.* to shew, they make their Principle of the Light to be the Divine Body of Christ, his Flesh and Blood, that came down from Heaven; according to the 6th of *John*, makes this Conclusion to Result from it; *viz.* That thereby it is very Evident that they make the Light to be a Creature, and more than that, to be a material and corporeal Creature.

The short of the matter *J. N.* says, lies in this form of Argument, the Divine Seed whereof Christ was naturally generated, and whereby we are regenerated is a Body.

But the Light within is one & the same thing with this *divine seed*. Therefore the Light within is a Body. Suppose this were granted, how does this prove his assertion, that it is a corporeal material Creature? Seeing Christ is that Divine Substance the Quakers make their Light to be.

See here *J. N.* presumes; upon his conclusion of a Body, he makes his consequence to be, that it is a Material and Corporeal Creature: But the Quakers Light is no more so by his Sillogism than *J. N.* is another kind of Being than he was made.

After this kind of method *J. N.* hath treated the Quakers, which is a Trick as himself says, seemingly to prove something, when really it proves nothing; like his Egg-Sophistry, *Reflect. on the Cond. &c.* pag. 56. The sequel will make this further appear; by which we may see that some School-men will venture at any thing, rather than learn to deny themselves; Self-Love, Self-Will, Self-Conceit, &c. But above all, 'tis Innocency God regards: Truth in the Inward parts he loves. 'Tis not what thou canst talk of, but what thou and men are in the Covenant of Righteousness, that renders thee and me, and all men acceptable in the sight of God, who will not give his Glory to another, nor his Praise to Graven Images.

There is one or two passages more in the close of *J. N.*'s Appendix, which concerns me, and requires my observation there, having omitted it in my Answer.

1st. He tells me, *'Tis one thing to Answer the Book, and another thing to answer the Man.* I confess 'tis so, but my Adversary has done neither

The Epistle to the Reader:

neither, truly and honestly, but Sophistically and Injuriouſly, as will appear by what follows; for 'tis one thing to Charge, and another to Prove: His Answer required Proof, and therein he is defective, and his Argument fallacious.

2^dy. He ſays, *He is not Ambitious of the laſt Word, becauſe wiſe men do not Judge of the Iſſue of a Diſpute by that meaſure.* He is now like to be tryed, whether he thinks his Answer carries that ſtrength of Evidence, as will incline him to put the Controverſie upon that iſſue. He farther tells me, *that I may have the laſt Word if I pleaſe; and the rather, he ſays, becauſe he thinks 'tis all I am like to get by the Engagement with him.*

Here to paſs by this Inſult, I muſt bear his Reproaches for Chriſt's ſake; for this I am ſure I have gotten: As for other ſort of Gains I muſt tell him plainly, I expect none by Writing; though perhaps my Adverſary may, and find his account in this world, by preſentment or otherwiſe: Therefore whatever end or aim he may have: What I have written is not either for the ſake of Controverſie, or worldly advantage, for I have no Market at the Stationers Shop; but purely for Truth and Innocencies ſake.

Thus, *Friendly Reader*, I ſhall take my leave of thee, and cloſe my Epistle with this Intimation; That if thou deſireſt to be Rightly informed concerning the Quakers Principle of the Divine Light, which my preſent Adverſary hath Villified and Reprehended; for thy ſatisfaction of the Truth thereof, *viz.* that *J. N.* hath ſo done, I recommend thee to the following diſcourſe: But for thy more general ſatisfaction, to the Works of that deceaſed Servant of the Lord *Roberts Barclay*, where together in one Volumn thou art preſented with many of the Doctrines and Principles of the aforeſaid People, as received, believed, and practiſed by all the gathered Churches of that People, throughout the ſeveral parts of the World, where God in his Providence hath allotted their habitations: But above all I commend thee to the Word of God in thy own Heart, that is for a Light to thy Paths; and conclude, as I am Thine, for the Truth's ſake.

Truth and Innocency defended, &c.

THe first thing I shall take notice of, is, his Character in his Title Page of *Learned*, what his end is in giving it me, I shall not determine, but lest he should thereby greater his Task, and to undeceive the Reader, I think fit to say, I never pretended to more than a small stock of School-Learning: Whatever his design was, I may truly say, my Adversary has not more exceeded in that, then he has allayed and lessened me in my Character, of a Gentleman and Quaker opposing the one to the other; as tho' to be a Quaker unqualified, me to be a Gentleman, which no ways commends his temper, and breeding. Though from hence he makes me the object of his scorn, Rendering me in these words; *A man of this sullen Tribe, whose visible Mark and Character is Rusticity*, pag. (2.) Doubtless the Disdain and Pride of his Heart was great, for he no sooner dropt pretensions to temper his Spirit and govern his Pen, but he fell into this extreme and lavish abuse of a whole Society of People, whom he Rails at in another place, terming them a *buter soul Mouthed Set*, pag. (19.)

Whatever liberty he thought fit to allow himself in treating me, whom he might think had affronted him: Common breeding and civility should have been a restraint upon him from direct Railing, and venting his Scorn and Derision of the Party for no other Reason, that I can perceive, but because they cannot bow to him with Cap and Knee.

The Extravagancies and personal Abuses which I observe in the forepart of his Treatise, I take to be the effect of Impatency, under contradiction and want of Humility, that should qualifie him to receive advice and counsel; but the saying of the Wise Man is verified, *Reprove not a Scorned, lest he hate thee: Rebuke a Wise man, and he will love thee.*

The first 20 pages of his Treatise is made up with Aggravations of this kind, occasioned by my Reflections on some passages in his Book, entituled, *A Reflection on the Conduct of human Life, &c.* Wherein I then thought, and still do, he hath greatly abused the *Quakers*, and misrepresented their Principle of the Divine Light, which I apprehend was by me sufficiently manifested, however by this occasion may now more fully appear.

This induced me to use these expressions, (*viz.*) That I was and still am pleased with all that tends to the propagation of Original & necessary Truth, but rejoyce where I find it spring from an upright mind, pure intention, and clean vessel; for whoso undertakes to reprehend the Intelligible Conduct of Human Life, ought first to purge himself from the Irregularities of his Moral Conduct.

This I confess implies a questioning his Sincerity, and good Manners, respecting the truth or falshood of his Assertions against the *Quakers* and their Principle, without relation to what he seems to insinuate by it, (*viz.*) a Charge against him for a loose and debauched Conversation, which was not in my thoughts, nor do I see any just cause he has to take it so, what I designed being otherwise. And with as much modesty I think as can well be expressed, avoiding the Charge till I came to the perticular instances of his Misrepresentations and Unjust Reflections, which I then proved, and thereto refer.

And if upon the whole it shall so appear to the Understanding and Consciences of the Readers, *J. N.* hath already granted me his Ignorance of the *Quakers* Principles, how little soever it otherwise concerned him to know them, will not excuse his misrepresenting them, consequently I hope he will grant his having so done, will not only excuse, but justifie me in charging it upon him, provided I do it in a *Christian* frame and Spirit, which is the next thing I have to observe, (*viz.*)

That *J. N.* charges me with a great deal of Passion and angry Resentment in my doing it, as also Rudeness and Incivility, and again that I fall foul of him in such a rude, violent and passionate manner, as is below the breeding of a Water-man: Here he misrepresents my temper, seeing to be blunt and plain is one thing, and to be rude, violent and passionate is another; I see not whence he fixes this Character on me of rude, violent and passionate, unless from a pretence of a Spiritual discerning, because I have not used any scandalous or uncivil Language to occasion such a censure, which I confess were a fault in me, were I guilty of it; But I have seriously considered of what I wrote, the matter, manner, and design of it; and am well satisfied I am innocent of this Charge, having not dealt uncivilly or unfairly, though down-right and plainly in my Language and Expressions, God the Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth that knows the secrets of all hearts, and knows how much either he or I are concerned in those Scripture applications, judge between him and me in this matter.

I confess I treat him as an Adversary to the Truth, but still justly, and with more meekness and temper, and I hope not less breeding then he hath done me; and as for Rudeness and Incivility they have my natural aversion, this I hope to make appear before I have done, with my Remarks of his usage and Treatment: If the Pride and Arrogancy of his mind hath rendred him impatient of contradiction and extream in his resentment, he must blame himself for that: my words and stile are obvious, as well as the hideous work he hath made with it; He tells me, he hopes he shall so govern his Pen, that the Defence shall not be near so passionate as the Charge. What measure of Passion he hath used, or doth allow himself, I will not undertake to define, but sure I am a great deal of that Rudeness and Scurility, besides the limits of ordinary decency he falsely charges me, he is found in the practice of him-
self,

self, and to prove this, I think it not sufficient to deduce it from the consequence of any Charge how false soever, for though that may appear to me, it may be a begging the Question from another; wherefore I design to make a Recital of his very Terms and Language: But first I would observe that *J. N.* not meeting with those uncivil terms in mine, which he employs against me, he quarrels with what hath been and is the practice of the Disciples and Followers of Christ throughout Ages, and perhaps with his own practice too in some respect, in putting People upon the examination of themselves, whether they are not guilty of such breaches of Gods righteous Law, as by Scripture-testimony may be applied to their consideration, and oft-times to their very condition, of which nature is my sober Expostulation, grounded upon manifest error and abuse of a Society of People in that which most nearly concerns them; for this cause it is he bespatters me and terms me a provoking and affronting Adversary. If this humor should have prevailed in the Apostles dayes, what work would it have made with their Epistles; not that I compare what I write to their Writings, but the tendency being the same made up of Scripture quotations, I may justly admire his treatment of me for it: would *J. N.* be pleased with his Auditors, if when he takes the like freedom in the Pulpit to expostulate with them about any part of the ill conduct of human Life, whereof he believes and in part knows many of them to be guilty, and therefore quotes and applies Scripture suitable to their state and condition, that any of them should rise up and catch him by the Throat, or at least publicly quarrel at his Doctrine, pretending he provokes and affronts them, because as they apprehend he too closely applies it to them? Yet this is the case betwixt me and *J. N.* whence he takes occasion thus evilly to treat me with such ill Language and Character as he hath done; But suppose he may plead the Relation betwixt him and his Hearers differs, they being under a civil Sanction: I grant that is a bond upon them, but the Precepts of *Christian Religion* is greater, and ought to be a bond upon all as well Priests as People, who ought to be in such a frame and humility of mind, as would render them fit to learn as well as teach; I perceive a contrary humor in *J. N.* which makes me consider what the Reason should be, whether a contempt of the Instrument as not learned enough, or from a natural aversion to reproof, heightened by a Reflection on his own station, I will not determine, sure I am that the abuse in his former, with the aggravation and misgoverned temper he hath shewn in this latter Treatise, discovers a want of Rectitude of Will and Affections, however his Understanding be.

And now having so far insisted upon, and discovered the subject & occasion of this offence and treatment thereon, I conceive my sober application of Scripture doctrine to him, respecting the Evil of those Snares and Temp-

tations of the Enemy I apprehend him fallen into, as well as personal Injuries and Abuses I find him guilty of, will vindicate my undertaking; and though I should be severe in my Censure, provided it be true and well grounded, it will no ways lessen or violate my Charity, no more then it would his or any bodies else when under the like concern; having thus said, I think I have removed the stress of his Objection against my treatment of him to his own Door. And here it may not be amiss to instance one perticular passage of mine, and shew the use he hath made of it, by which the rest may be judged, upon occasion of his Ignominious Reflection on the *Quakers* in rendering them dark, awkward, untoward and unprincipled in the way of representing their Principle (*viz.*) the Light within, thereby discrediting one of the noblest Theories in the World. I apply to him some Scripture-Texts, perticularly that of the 18th of *Matthew*, where our Lord and Saviour Christ exhorts his Disciples to avoid offending one of the little Ones that believed in him, charging them, *Verf. 10. Take heed that ye despise not one of the little Ones*: And from thence I proceed and say, I fear thou art guilty in this perticular, (*viz.*) of despising the Testimony of God in this Age through the meanness of the Instruments: consider what is said, *Thiss. 4. 8. He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not Man, but God who hath also given unto us his holy Spirit.*

Page. (7.) This *J. N.* is pleased to term a Charge *that savours strongly of a Spirit of detraction*: Does it so? I think not; But can he see a Mote in my Eye, and not the Beam in his own? What? Is his Ignominious Reflection (aforesaid) on a whole Society of People at once? No Detraction. But he goes on, and calls it a *blasphemous piece of Arrogance*: But why? the reason he gives, The *Quakers* are not equally inspired with the Apostles: I know no body pretends they are; does it therefore follow they are not divinely inspired at all; and if they be, that it is a blasphemous piece of Arrogance to make the despising of the *Quakers* the same with despising Christ; surely no: He confesses himself if that be proved,

Page. (8.) (*viz.*) That they are divinely inspired, he shall allow of the Expression till then; he begs me not to be angry, if he tells me it puts him in mind of a Story. Now this Blasphemous piece of Arrogance he charges me with, is reduced to this Question, whether the *Quakers* are divinely inspired or not? It is a wonder to me that a man of his professed Principle should doubt it, seeing he says the Divine Logos, or Light within, is the great and universal Oracle lodged in every mans Breast, and that in it are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.

Page. (105.) And in his Postscript, *That it is no special privilege, but the common and universal benefit of all men, yea of all the Inellegant Creation, who all see and understand in this Light of God.* Again he says, *I do not appropriate this Divine Light to Moral and Spiritual things, but extend it as far*

as all Truth; yea as far as all that is Intelligible, which I suppose to be perceived and understood in this Divine Light, &c. Now I query, is not Divine Inspiration included in this Principle, in which are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge? and is it not intelligible Truth? and if Intelligible, is it not dispensed and conveyed to Man, through his Principle lodged in every mans breast, which extends as far as all Truth, whereby it is perceived and understood; why then may not the *Quakers* be partakers of Divine Inspiration as well as others, seeing it is necessary for all true Christians to know and experience: There is a Spirit in man, said Elihu, and the Inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding, Job 32 8. And by the Liturgy of the Church of England all are instructed to pray for it, which shews it is attainable, as appears by the Collect in these Words; Lord, from whom all good things do come, grant us thy humble Servants, that by thy Holy Inspiration we may think those things that be good, and by thy Merciful guiding may perform the same through our Lord Jesus Christ. Again, Right Judgment in all things by the Holy Spirit prayed for. God who at this time didst reach the Hearts of thy faithful People, by sending to them the Light of thy holy Spirit; grant us by the same Spirit to have a right Judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in thy holy Comforts; &c. Again, the Holy Spirit prayed for by the Church of England to direct in all things. O God, forasmuch as without thee we are not able to please thee, mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and Rule our Hearts through Jesus Christ our Lord. Again in the Epistle; Be not drunk with Wine wherein is Excess, but be filled with the Spirit, speaking to your selves in Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, &c. Ephes. 5. 15. I have been the more particular in these Collections, to shew that Divine Inspiration and the Guidings of the Spirit is not only attainable, but a necessary Christian qualification, which some ignorantly imagining the contrary, are ready to deride the *Quakers* for pretending to, whilst they pray for it themselves; but perhaps my Adversary may be of the mind of one of his Coat, who lately told me the *Quakers* are no Christians, because not baptized, meaning not being done unto according as the Law requires, (viz.) Sprinkled with a little Water in the Face from off one of their Hands, and signed with the Sign of the Cross; consequently the despising of them, he may think is not to be reckoned as despising of Christ.

Coll. 5th Sunday
after Easter.

Coll. Mund. in the
Whitsun-week.

Coll. 19 Sund.
after Trinity.

Epist. 20 Sund.
after Trinity.

By his Story of the Oxford-Schollar pumping a *Quaker*, I am inclined to believe, from what I have heard of the extravagant and notorious Abuses, and obscene carriages and behaviour of many of the said Schollars towards the *Quakers* at the time of their Religious Exercise in the Worship of God; That it is not improbable but this might be on the same account, or
for

for some testimony against their Lewdness and Prophaneness; and if so, consider, is it not an encouragement to a Lewd Crew to commit the Like Rudeness as have been practised upon the *Quakers* when they find it tickles the fancy, and affords a pleasant Jest to a fellow of their Collidge.

Whatever he thinks of his Story, I am sure he hath made an ill application of it to me, and worse to the Texts of Scripture I quoted him, forasmuch as it tends to make void the Doctrine of Christ Jesus implied in the 25th of *Matthew*, (viz.) *That which is done to his little Ones, he takes as done unto himself.* And dare he say that the *Quakers*, who fears God and work Righteousness, though they have not been sprinkled with Water from any of their Hands, nor none else, are not of the number of Christ's little Ones that believe in him? And consequently dare he say, that they are not included in that Exhortation before mentioned? *Math. 18. 10.* And if they are, what means and whereto tends the Language and Character he hath given them before mentioned.

I might here proceed to examine distinctly every Objection of his and my application of Scripture to his consideration, with observation of his Treatment thereof, as in the foregoing instance, but I design not to give my self nor the Reader that trouble.

Therefore shall content my self briefly to touch on several particulars, and shew the reason and occasion of my Queries to him wherewith he is so much offended; and I question not but my so doing will justify my design in quoting the Scriptures with which he is so highly provoked and affronted.

I query, hath not Unrighteousness entered in through Self-love and esteem, which blinds the Eye and causes the Tongue to speak unrighteous things? Is not Self exalted to sit in the Temple of God? &c.

The occasion and reason of these Queries, is his manifest abuse of the *Quakers*, both in misrepresenting their Principle and villifying and reproaching them, and that not only in the aforementioned Terms of *dark, awkward and untoward*, but in rendering them in general grossly ignorant, as being neither *Rational* nor *Intelligible* in their account of their Light within, because they have not reduced it to such a Philosophical Notion as he affects, viz. *The Omnipresence of the Ideal World*, though at the same time he says, *They confirm it with the Authority of St. John's Gospel.*

Is not the consequence of this a manifest over-valuing his own Notion and way of explaining the Light within beyond and above the dictates of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the holy Evangelist was divinely inspired and instructed; and does not this spring from Self-love and esteem? and does not that blind the Eye, and cause the Tongue to speak unrighteous things? and when self love and esteem gets up, where does it sit but in the Temple of God; might I not hence say, art thou not decking thy self with thy corrupt Wisdom, which is the forbidden Fruit, and will prove folly

in the end; by corrupt Wisdom, I mean not as he wrongly intimates Human Learning in gross; but the quaking Wit and unassisted Reason of man in the mis-use or abuse of it. Something like this is his own Phraze on himself, viz. his unlucky fancy, pag. 4. where he makes a scoff at me about the Light within, in these words, viz. *That he has exchanged his old Quaking for a better one, and that the Light within is turned into a Flame's* The bare mentioning of which shall suffice, being a plain discovery of his frothy Wit and corrupt Wisdom, which is farther manifested in his charge against the Quakers, in his Postscript, where he takes their making use of these Divine Words and Expressions of *John* the holy Evangelist, in confirmation of their Principle of the Light within, as loose and canting, and which may look too much like Prophanisms; and all this joyned with as positive as uncharitable assertion, viz. *That they understand neither the Light they profess nor St. John's Gospel*, was the occasion of some other Queries, viz. What author O Man, thou boastest thyself? Art thou wiser than thy Maker, whose Wisdom hath brought forth and taught his People those expressions? Canst thou by searching find out God or the Almighty unto perfection? I tell thee nay, and here without pretending to be Prophet, I might and did say that God would confound his Wisdom, and bring to nought his Understanding wherein it was exalted; I pray God he may witness it in mercy to thee. This general villifying and reproaching Charge against the Quakers, I have termed an evil Presumption, and what if I had said Blasphemy against him that dwells in Heaven; is there not such a thing? and may not the Quakers, as many of them as truly love and fear God, and work Righteousness in the Earth be of the number that dwell in Heaven. How dare he then say, or how can he say truly of the many thousands he knows not, that they neither understand the Light they profess nor St. John's Gospel, without blasting their Fame? hence it is that I take occasion to say, that it is not a light thing to speak evil of things one understands not; much less wilfully to blast the fame of God's Name and Works in the Earth, in and by his People: I did not say he did it wilfully, therein he wrongs my expression, but I desire he may not. I behold the danger he is in, because Gods ways agree not with mans ways and conceited Wisdom and Notions; which his Wisdom from above ever did and will confound.

This Judgment is just and Righteous, and will stand for God over the heads of all such who villify and reproach his People in the use of those Divine Words and Expressions his wisdom teacheth, and in opposition thereto exalts the words of their own wisdom, viz. the wisdom of this world which is corrupt, and which God hath made foolish; wherefore the Apostle Paul in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, professes his Preaching was not with enticing Words of mans Wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of Power, that their Faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the Power of God.

I now come to observe the ill use and perversion Y. N. hath made of my sense of corrupt Wisdom, which I think I have sufficiently explained upon the aforementioned Query, (viz.) Art thou not decking thy self with thy corrupt Wisdom?

By it he is pleased at first to say, he supposes I must mean Philosophy, and the study of Arts and Sciences, which again more positively he says, I will needs have to be Corrupt Wisdom and the Forbidden Fruit, though I do where say so, nor intend so; nor is reasonably to be implied from my words. Upon this Supposition of his own framing, he sets himself always, considering who should make me, who am myself, as he says, a Schollar, condemn all Human Learning in gross; under the name of Corrupt Wisdom, and blame him for decking himself with it, and all with design to bring me under a Dilemma. Concluding he hath fastened this upon me, he presently makes use of it to a Contradiction of my self. Citing my words, pag. 10. of *Just Repreh.* &c. viz. That the Divine Light assists the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the attainment of *Necessary Arts and Sciences*; but he has left out the Word *Necessary*; so One would think from hence he should have concluded, that I intended something else by Corrupt Wisdom, namely the unsanctified Wit and Reason of the unregenerate man, which would exalt it self to Act and Judge about Divine and Supernatural things; and not simply Human Learning, &c. in gross; but he proceeds upon his mistaken Position, and says,

What does the Divine Light assist the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the attainment of Corrupt Wisdom, and such as will prove Folly in the end? Can that Wisdom be corrupt that is taught by the assistance of the Divine Light, or is that Light to be esteemed whose Instructions are so corrupt?

Who sees not the fallacy of this corrupt way of arguing, (viz.) drawing positive Conclusions from Suppositions; nay false Premises, which removed, the whole Argument falls to the ground as impertinent, and not true in the sense wherein the Question is concerned; however he proceeds to query, *How are these things consistent, unless Mr. Vickris will be understood not of condemning Human Learning in general as corrupt, but only of that which is the object of my particular Study; but what if I will be under neither, seeing my Words are general, and has no relation to either one or the other; is there not a better sense of corrupt Wisdom, namely what I have defined it?* Here he manifestly again begs the Question; and supposing the Words will not hold to be understood of Human Learning, in general as corrupt, he would reduce it to the object of his particular Study, that so if he failed of bringing me under a contradiction to my self in the former, he might at least under the other Dilemma, (viz.) of condemning the particular Matter of his Study as corrupt, and so guilty of an ignorant and foolish Censure; is this arguing like a Philosopher, or is it not rather Sophistical and Quibbling?

been in practising this Doctrine, and how ill he hath maintained the Character he Recommends. Also how extremely partial he hath been to himself in Re-criminating me; for whilst he admires what a rude and uneducated Pen I write with, he plainly shews his blind side was turned to what he was doing himself: I might here again apply a certain Text of Scripture to him, but finding he takes a great offence thereat, rendering me a provoking and affronting Adversary for so doing, I shall forbear.

*A Blasphemous piece of Arrogance.
Malicious spiteful abusive Scurrility.
Barbarous Treatment, dregs of his Venom,
Cholar, Filth, riddling his soul, Stomach,
With more to the same effect.*

There is one thing more I have to remark, before I finish this part of his Treatise, and that has still relation to the great pretence he makes to Breeding and Charity, though I think I have sufficiently shewed by the foregoing Language of his, a true Epitome of what sort his is: I cannot but observe one other perticular instance of both, where he *P. 19.* gives the *Quakers* this Character, as is before noted, (viz.) *A Bitter soul-mouthed Sect*; and then says, *What the temper of this Gentleman is in his Conversation, I know not; but if he governs his Tongue no better than he does his Pen, and 'tis strange if he should, I think it would be a Blessing both to himself and others if he were speechless*; By the way, I hope it will be found better governed than his.

O Rare instance of Charity; had these expressions dropt from any other than a Clergy-man, Ignorance and Passion might have pleaded for an allay; with me it is no wonder if he be angry at the *Quakers*, & call them a Bitter soul-mouthed Sect, I apprehend no other reason for it, but because they have from time to time set forth the Persecutions and Cruelties, excited and acted by some sort of men, for the Peaceable Exercise of their Religion, in whose Jaws God hath put a Hook, otherwise it is but too manifest they would be found in the same Practices again. And what is it now become so dangerous to question a Clergy-man's Civility and Sincerity in Language, and Treatment of the *Quakers*, that it would be a mercy if such a one were Speechless: Would he have me struck dumb, or my Tongue cut out? God be thanked, he hath neither power for the one nor the other; if he had, it were greatly to be suspected my Right hand would go next.

As to my Conversation, it is known amongst my Neighbours and Acquaintance, but more perticularly to the Lord, for the honour of whose Name I have been more concerned, than for all worldly Honour, Interest and Esteem amongst men; for whose sake I have been made able to suffer hard things; and grant him, it is the Principle of the *Quakers* rather to strike the other Cheek, than smite again; but this does not bar them from a proper Vindication of their Innocency, and Representation of their In-

juries and Abuses, both of Person and Principle; this is not inconsistent with returning Good for Evil, a practice the *Quakers* acknowledge as a Christian Duty, and are and have been found in; for as the Lord hath forgiven them much, I know no People have had more to forgive, and none more ready to shew it upon Repentance: Having thus far appeared for the vindication of my Innocency and Character as a *Christian Quaker*, I shall bear the Remainder of his Reproaches, contenting my self with the better part of my Task, viz. the defence of the *Quakers* Principle of the Divine Light of Christ Jesus, and so far as I am concerned therein, to clear it from my Adversaries Calumnies.

I think it necessary in the first place, to acquaint the Reader, that whatever faculty J. N. has of spinning out matters of Religious Controversie to a fine Thread, reducing them to a Philosophical Notion, and great nicety of distinction, I have not, neither do affect it, nor do I apprehend the naked simple Truth requires so much Artifice to define it.

The two first passages he objects to is, 1st, The use I make of some Expressions of his, as implying a sort of Confession to the *Quakers* Principle, and that the difference lay only in explaining it, and that defect the *Quakers* Ignorance; His Words are, *If the Quakers understood their own Notion, and knew how to explain it, and into what Principles to resolve it, it would not very much differ from mine*: Postscript, pag. (183.) Hereupon he queries, *Does it therefore follow that I confess the Truth of the Quakers Principle of the Light, because I allow the Notion in it self to be true when rightly understood?* — I answer, Yes; for the Notion is one thing, and the Mode and Method of explaining it is another: The general Notion of the Existence of one God the Creator of all things, is a true Notion, and a defect in explaining it will not destroy the truth of that Notion. He queries again, *Does the general truth of any Notion, rightly stated, infer the Truth of this or that particular way of explaining it*: I answer, No, upon the same reason of difference: The truth of the Notion is objectively manifested, and received by Faith, but the Explanations of it may vary, according to the differing Capacities and Reasonings of men; His instance of the *Solipsidian* and *Epicurean* reaches not the case, because their difference with their Adversaries arises from the ambiguity in the Proposition it self, and not from the Modes of Explanation: There is no Ambiguity assigned in the proposition it self, viz. The Divine Light within, *J. N.* and the *Quakers* both agreeing, that it is the *Divine Logos*, according to *John* the Evangelist, though they may differ in the explanation of it.

The second is, that I complain against him for not quoting the *Quakers* own words and Authors, in representing their Principles,

Principles, and I think not without Reason; my Words are as follows, Who undertakes to confute the Principles of any People, ought to take them up, and state them rightly and honestly according as they are believed and owned by themselves, quoting their own Words and Authors, and not barely as he conceives and imagines them to be, as suiting his design.

To this J. N. answers, *I thought I might trust my Memory so far as to represent their Sense; But I say there is a danger of varying or warping from their sense, where the Understanding presides the Memory, the Judgment is fixed from a conceived Notion, without regard to the Words and Expressions of the Authors themselves, in representing their Principles.* He objects to this, pag. (29.) that I have not brought so much as one single Citation out of any *Quakerish Writer*, as he terms it, to disprove the Representation of their Principle given by him. What then? I apprehend it was not necessary, having before on another occasion effectually done it out of R. B's *Apology*, pag. (110.) first Edition. Besides, the matter having relation to misrepresentation of Principles, and not Testimonies, it was sufficient to deny it, asserting the *Quakers* Faith in opposition thereto, according to Scripture, Reason and Consequence. He tells me, *'Tis one thing to propose, and another thing to prove.* I readily grant it him, and believe he finds it so, by the Stress he is forced to put on undue Implication and Consequence; But let me tell him his Propositions not being by way of Query, but positive Assertions concerning a Peoples Principle, and that not in their own Words, but his Construction and Sense, required more Evidence in exposing, then a presumption upon his Integrity in representing them. However the matter in Question now is, whether he hath given a true account of their Principle or not, which is the chief thing to be considered, and my present business to examine.

J. N. asserts, *The Quakers usually talk of this Light within* Postsc. (184.) *as of some Divine Communication and Manifestation, (only.)* By this assertion I conclude he represents the *Quakers* to own the Light within to be an accident, and not a substantial inherent Principle of divine excellency; I shall gently pass by his dissent upon the word *Inherent*, which though it be not used as an attribute strictly, belonging to this Substance, yet Omnipresence is; and this word *Inherent* bearing a relative sense of the nearness or presence of that Substance to our minds, is not such an ill suited Term as he would make it. This construction of his words *Communication and Manifestation (only)* to be an accident he endeavours to evade, by lessening the weight of my Argument from pag (32.) the first of *John* the Evangelist; but before I consider that, I shall pursue my conclusion, viz. that he makes the *Quakers* Light to be an accident: It is obvious his words *Communication and Manifestation (only)*

is opposed to the Divine Substance it self, as the formal, and immediate object of our Faith and Knowledge; in which sense the *Quakers* profess and own the Light: But Communication and Manifestation (only) is a created effect, and consequently neither the formal object in the sense aforesaid, nor indeed the efficient cause of our illumination; but the illumination it self, which being the product of some previous Agent, can amount to no more than an accident, which differs from a Substance, as the effect from the cause.

Having thus distinguished upon the Proposition, I see no reason *J. N.* has to fault, either my Conclusion or Argument, from the first of *John*, that *the Life of the Word is the Light of men*, and my inferring from thence that it is a Substance; considering he confesses the Word, and the Life of the Word to be real Substances, and that it must be granted the Life is the Light; *I am the Light of the World*, said Christ Jesus; *he that followeth me shall not walk in Darkness, but have the Light of Life*, *John 8. 12.* These (*viz.*) Light and Darkness are of contrary Powers, really, and not fantastically express, consequently this Light must be a Divine Substance in opposition to an Accident; As to *J. N.*'s distinction between Efficiently and Formally, as applied to the Light, I think it over-nice, because he makes the Light in both respects the cause of our Illumination; the one as the enlightener of our Understanding, the other as the object of our Conception; and what's the difference more than in the Mode or Form of expression, seeing in both senses he must needs be understood to infer the Light to be a Real Substance? And forasmuch as he hath at length granted me the *Quakers* make the Light to be so too, *viz.* pag.(36.) a real Substance; let him not henceforth say, they talk of it as a divine communication and manifestation (only,) which term (Only) whatever he thinks of it, or however subtilly he seeks to evade, it is exclusive of substance in general, upon the explication and reason I have given, and consequently a misrepresentation of their Principle; like as if he should say, the Gospel (which is the Power of God to Salvation) were (only) a Declaration of good things; would not this be exclusive of the Power, which is the Substance?

J. N. says, *Though it be too plain to be denied, that the Quakers* (pag.37.) *make the Light to be a Real Substance; yet 'tis also as plain that they do not make it the very Substance of God;* for which he quotes the following passage out of *R. B.*'s *Apol.* pag. 133. "By this Seed, Grace, and Word of God, and Light, wherewith we say every man is enlightened, and hath a measure of it, which strives with them, in order to save them, and which may by the stubbornness and wickedness of man's Will, be quenched, bruised, wounded, pressed down, slain and crucified, we understand not the proper Essence and Nature of God, precisely taken, which

"which is not divisable into Parts and Measures, as being a most pure
 "simple Being; void of all composition and division, and therefore can
 "neither be resisted, hurt, wounded, crucified or slain, by all the efforts
 "and strength of men. But we understand a Spiritual, Heavenly, and
 "Invisible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son and Spirit dwells;
 "and this we call *Tabernaculum Dei*, or the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Flesh
 "and Blood of Christ which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints
 "do feed, and are thereby nourished into Eternal Life. Observe that R. B's
 Position is so clear, and well applied with Arguments, that what he asserts
 he doth at the same time in effect prove, by evident Reason, and Invin-
 cible Consequence; which I perceive J. W. in his own words had neither
 cause nor mind to dispute.

Now the Question is not, whether the Quakers believe the Light to be a
 Real and Spiritual Substance, but what they believe this Substance is; and
 here if he expects I should follow him in his Philosophical Notions, and
 explanation of this Principle, he will find himself mistaken; for that's be-
 sides my Province, nor have I so learned Christ, but according to the Te-
 stimony of Holy Writ, and Language of the Holy Ghost therein reveal-
 ed; I may treat something of it, believing it is a great Presumption, and
 unjustifiable Curiosity in any man, to dive farther into this Mystery than
 what God hath, or doth please to reveal; And yet it is a greater Presump-
 tion, and I can hardly forbear calling it Profane, to deride and vilify
 those Holy Words and Expressions in the mouths of his People, which
 God hath been pleased to make use of, to reveal himself by; and prefer
 others which his Spirit hath not taught; if my Adversary shall still think it
 adviseable to continue this practice of rendering such Scripture Language,
 loose and canting, I shall leave him to the Reproof and Judgment of that
 Spirit, which in time will be found too wise and strong for him.

We believe that this Divine Light is Christ Jesus, the Son of Gods
 love to lost man; the ingrafted Word, the same that became Flesh, and that
 dwelleth in the Saints, *John* 1. 14. *The Word became Flesh, and pitched his
 Tent in us; who is from Everlasting, the Second Adam, or Lord from Hea-
 ven, the quickening Spirit, 1 Cor. 15. 45, 47. Who is the Image of the In-
 visible God, the first Born of every Creature, by whom all things were created,
 and for him, 1 Col. 1. 15, 16. And therefore he is in all things; though
 with respect to operation, as I observed formerly, after a different man-
 ner and measure; We believe him to be the Propitiation and Sacrifice for
 the Sins of the whole World, the Mediator and Intercessor betwixt God
 and man, even the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5. Then which, there is no
 other Name under Heaven given amongst men, whereby we must be saved,
Acts 4. 12. That though this blessed Name (*viz.*) Christ Jesus, signifying
 the appointed Saviour, having relation to his Heavenly Mankind, which he*

took upon, is distinguished from the Word or *Logos*, as 'tis God himself in the abstract, or as precisely taken, yet we do not thereby divide him from his intire Immediate Union, and *Being* as God in himself, blessed for ever more, *Phil. 2. 6. 7.* No more then the Apostle *Paul* in *1 Cor. 11. 3.* *And the Head of every man is Christ, and the Head of Christ is God.* *Paul* in this place must needs intend the Man *Christ*; and this agrees with what *Christ* said of himself, *My Father is greater, then I,* *John 14. 28.* And this also agrees with the Confession of the Christian Faith set forth in the *Lithurgy* of the *Church of England*; viz. "The right Faith is, that we believe, and confess, that the Lord *Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, is God and Man, equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his Manhood, who although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one *Christ*, one not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but taking of the Manhood into God, &c." I have been the more particular in reciting this Confession, foreseeing I may have occasion to make use of it before I finish this Reply.

Having made this digression, and thus truly stated our Faith and persuasion concerning this Divine Principle of the Light within, what it is; I shall consider *J. N's* objections against it, grounded upon the aforementioned quotation out of *R. B's Apol. 133.*

By these words of *R. B's* Position (viz.) 'By the Seed, Grace, Word of God and Light, we understand not the proper Essence and Nature of God, precisely taken, and he gives the Reasons, which I need not repeat, but we understand a Spiritual, Heavenly, and Invisible Principle, in which God as Father, Son and Spirit dwells. That which *John Norris* infers from hence is, that *R. B.* makes the Light, though a Substance, not the same with, but really distinct from the Substance or Essence of God.

This Consequence as so laid down, I deny, as being injurious to *R. B's* sense, for though he says the Light, &c. wherewith every man is enlightened, and hath a measure of it, &c. is not the proper Essence and Nature of God Precisely taken, (as in its own intire fulness;) It is manifest by his following words, he understands or intends the Deity or Godhead it self in the abstract, as he was and is everlastingly in himself, a most pure simple Being, void of all Composition or Division, as he well observes; I may add, incomprehensible dwelling in the Light, which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, or can see, *1 Tim. 6. 16.* And again, *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the Bosom of the Father he hath declared him,* *John 1. 18.* and *6. 46.* And God is said to be in the Light, *1 John 1. 7.* And therefore God as so considered, and precisely taken, in his proper Essence, Nature and Fulness dwelling in himself cannot be properly said to be mans Light otherwise than in and through the Mediator, he being so inaccessible as before; For the same

Divine Being, which covereth himself with Light as with a Garment, Psal. 104. 2. dwells in the Light, dwells in his Son our blessed Lord, Christ Jesus, who is in the Father, and the Father in him; whom the Father hath sent, and who (in Gods divine Light) is come a Light into the World, that whosoever believeth on him, should not abide in Darkness, John 12. 46. Here God is in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, 2 Cor. 5. 19. And Christ is Light Approachable and Communicable in measure to the Children of men. To him God hath not given the Spirit (or Light thereof) by measure; John 3. 33. But unto every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the Gift of Christ, Ephel. 4. 7. Thus God in Christ, as with relation to his manifestation, to us, and in us, is distinguished, but not divided from the proper Essence and Nature of God himself, precisely taken: (But R. B's supposing the measure of the Light or Seed of God, as in man, not the Essence of God precisely taken, implies it may be in some sense taken to be the Essence and Nature of God;) And this is doubtless what R. B. intended, and is all that can be fairly deduced from his Words, and not what F. N. infers, that he makes the Light not the same, but a distinct Substance from the Substance or Essence of God; and this is manifest in R. B's explanation of this Spiritual, Heavenly and Invisible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son and Spirit dwells, that he understands Christ the Heavenly Man by *Vehiculum Dei*, and the *Spiritual Body of Christ*, the *Flesh and Blood of Christ* which came down from Heaven; which is all one thing, and represent Christ, of which all the Saints do feed, and are thereby nourished unto Eternal Life, as may be read at large in the 6th of John the Evangelist, where Christ perceiving his Disciples to murmur at this as a hard saying, which they understood not, he explains what he meant by his *Flesh and Blood*, viz. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; the Words that I speak unto you they are Spirit, and they are Life*, John 6. 63. From whence it follows that R. B. makes the Spiritual and Heavenly Principle to be Christ, *Who was*, and is, *that true Light which lighteth every one that cometh into the World*, John 1. 9. Again, *I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me shall not abide in Darkness, but have the Light of Life*, Joh. 8. 12. Now if this Light be Christ, and if Christ be both God and Man, (and as such that true Light) as is most certainly true; it inevitably follows that he has a two-fold Nature; yet but one Christ, and one Light, one undivided divine Substance, according to the aforementioned Confession of Faith; "One not by Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God": This is plain. Now by taking the Manhood into God, Christ hath not made void his Union in Substance with the Father, nor is he a divided Substance from the Substance of the Father and Essence of God; nor do R. B's words infer such a thing; But that by means of his Heavenly Manhood he appears as in a middle Nature, subject (as with respect to Man)

to the Condescension of a Mediator, and therefore may be resisted, hurt, wounded, crucified or slain, as to man and in man, as in a Seed, by the Stubbornness and Wickedness of man's will, though as God, dwelling in himself he is not, nor cannot be subject to any of these things: But Christ our High-Priest was and is, and such a High-Priest became us; For we have not a High-Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities; But was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without Sin, Heb. 4. 15.

Having thus cleared the quotation of R. B. from J. N.'s Mis-implication and Consequence, what I have said may serve for an Answer to that passage of his (Pag 39.) viz. *That the Quakers do not hold their Light to be the very Substance and Essence of the Deity*; though at the same time he says, *I think they ought, and that they are inconsistent with themselves in that they do not.* I shall leave him to think as he pleases concerning my self, in having subverted his Notion. But J. N. goes on, and gives this as his Reason for his foregoing Position; For (says he) *that Text of St. John, In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, which they quote to prove the Light to be a Substantial Principle, does not prove so much as that, unless the Proposition be understood formally, and if it be, then it proves a great deal more, viz. That it is not only a Substance which is all they infer from it; but also a Divine Substance strictly speaking, even the very Essence of the Deity.*

Ans. I readily grant there is a difference, at least in the explanation of our Notion, which I may further consider in its place; but first I would examine how he fastens his inconsistency upon us, from that Text out of John; I already perceive where the matter pincheth, and can as easily untie his Knot; The stress of his Argument is this, *Though the Life of the Word be the Light of men, it will not therefore follow, that admitting the Life to be a Substantial Principle, that the Light is so too; because the latter may be only an effect, and not the proper Agent, and so equivalent with the Terms*; He would have fixed on us, of *Communication and Manifestation* (only); but if he examine the Text a little further, he may find his mistake, for I am sure it is plain enough, that this Light is Christ, and consequently must be not only a Substance, which he falsely says in these Words, *Is all they infer from it, But also a Divine Substance*; read John 1. 6, 7, 8, 9. *There was a Man sent from God, whose Name was John, the same came for a Witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. Who is this him, but the Light Christ? If he read R. B. thoroughly, he would have told him, that this Him, is to be referred to the Light, and not to John; that all may believe through him, which could not be through John, as not hearing him; Vers. (8.) He was not that Light, but was sent to bear Witness of that Light: Vers. (9.) That was the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the World. Is not this plain and positive? what can be added to*

illustrate

illustrate it? Is not J. N. hereby fairly convicted, that the aforementioned Text proves what he says it does not, (viz.) that the Light is a Divine Substance; and consequently the Inconsistency his, and not the Quakers; But allowing his Proposition to be understood formally, which I know no Quaker denies, (viz.) That the Light Christ is the formal object of our Faith, Knowledge and Worship; What does he mean by saying, *It proves a great deal more*; More then what? then the Divine Substance, which is Christ Jesus, for so the Quakers do, and have declared their Faith in him; Oh! but I perceive he is for advancing his Notion of his Light, *to be the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking*; which are his express words; Oh! the great Presumption and Folly of man, while I am writing of this, I have an awful Reverence upon my mind, of that great Incomprehensible Being of all Beings, compared with our love and best estate, the habitable parts of his Earth; magnifying him; that in his wonderful Counsel and divine Wisdom, hath found out a way in commiseration to our lost estate, and in condescension to our mean capacity, to convey his Love and Life to us, through such a Divine medium, as renders us capable of enjoying him, (viz.) through Jesus Christ his beloved Son our Lord, whom he sent forth out of his own Bosom from the beginning, to take upon him our Nature, and not the Nature of Angels; to suffer throughout all Ages; and be as a Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World, that he might be a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World, and a Mediator and Intercessor to God, to restore lost man to him, and in the fulness of time to take upon him our Flesh, who gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified of in due time; by whom God hath in these last Dayes spoken unto us, viz. by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom also he made the Worlds, who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Substance, and upholding all things by the Word of his Power, when he had by himself purged our Sins, sat down at the Right hand of the Majesty on high. Heb. 1. 3. 7. 13.

But to return to the matter, Why is it Presumption and Folly? because the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking, is the Godhead it self in the Abstract, distinguished from Christ Jesus our Lord, who is both God and Man; as is before observed; equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferiour to the Father as touching his Manhood, and yet the Godhead and Manhood united in him: Now the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking, or the Godhead it self in the Abstract, or precisely taken, is a Substance incomprehensible; and so considered is a brightness incommunicable to our weak Capacities; and not otherwise to be come unto, seen, felt, and enjoyed, but through a Medium, which Medium is Christ Jesus: Well then, is it not Presumption and Folly, to pretend to a Light inaccessible, as a means of knowledge; which according

to *J. N.*'s notion of the Light, as is above stated, must needs be such; because the very Essence necessarily implies the Fulness, and the Fulness immediately applied is Light unapproachable, 1 Tim. 6. 16. John 14. 16. Jesus saith unto him, *I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man cometh to the Father but by me; believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* Though God the Father be in Christ immediately, yet in us not so immediately, as in Christ: *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father;* No seeing or knowing the Father but in him; who is the Brightness of Gods Glory, and the express Image of his Substance: And this is a comfortable Doctrine, that our Light is proportioned to our understanding; otherwise we should be confounded; were not the Sun so placed in the Firmament, as to convey a measure or proportion of its light and heat to us by its Beams, through the vast Medium of the Air, we should be burnt up; does not this Doctrine plainly infer, his Notion of the *Light*, being the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking; and yet as so applied to Man to be his natural and ordinary way of understanding; To be contrary to Scripture, Reason, common Experience, and natural Consequence.

But let us consider what Argument doth *J. N.* bring, either of Scripture, or Reason, to enforce or maintain the Credit of his Notion; None, but makes the two following Queries.

1st. What less then that, meaning the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking, can be a Light to the Soul? I answer, that *wherewith every man is enlightened; or that Lighteth every Man,* and is measurably given to man, is the proper Light of the Soul; for though in it self or as in Christ it is the fulness of the Godhead, dwelling in him; so the Life of the Word is the fulness in the Word; and Christ is that Word, and that Word is God; But a measure of that Life of Christ in us, is our Spiritual Divine Light; which measure of Life is not divided from his Life, but proportioned to us as the Beams from the Sun, which may be intercepted and vailed by the thick Clouds of Darkness and Wickedness that overspreads mens hearts.

His other Query is either grounded upon an ignorant, or wilful Presumption; That what is not the very Essence of the Deity, strictly speaking, is not God; but Created; his query is, *How can any thing that is not God, or that is created be so, viz. a Light to the Soul?* Here he miserably begs the Question, upon at best a mistaken Notion, viz. That there is no middle Substance betwixt the Godhead and us; the contrary thereto I have made appear, (viz.) That there is a middle Substance; which is Christ; the Heavenly Man, the Mediator, not created but begotten; and this doubtless he very well knew was the Quakers Principle; quoting a passage out of the same page, wherein it is expressed in *G. K.'s Way to the City of God*; where reprehending that

mistaken Notion; says he, *They have supposed, that the Spirit or Mind of a Man or an Angel is next unto the Godhead; which I deny; for the Heavenly or Divine Substance, or Essence, of which the Divine Birth was both conceived in Mary; and is inwardly conceived in the Saints, is of a Middle Nature: This Middle Nature he calls a Divine Substance, or Essence; not as if it were the Godhead it self, or a Particle or Portion of it, and so doubtless he held the distinction upon the same reason and ground as is given by R. B.* Thus it appears G. K. as well as R. B. makes the Divine Light a Spiritual Divine Substance, and that Substance *Christ*, revealed and made manifest in men; who is both God and Man, or God united with the Manhood; as may abundantly appear out of his Writings, *The Way cast up; and The Way to the City of God*; consequently not made, nor created, but begotten, according to the aforementioned Confession of Faith of the Church of England.

But J. N. still goes on and says, *'Tis plain that they do not make the Divine Light the proper Substance of God, but a certain Middle Nature; which elsewhere, viz. in his Treatise of the grossness of the Quakers Principle, he makes to be a Creature, or a Material Creature; in which he is grossly abusive, as may be farther manifested in its time and place: But here he is out again, for this certain Middle Nature, he speaks of from that passage out of G. K. before recited; Is the begotten of God; as his Words plainly intimate; and consequently must be his proper Substance, as with respect to the Godhead of Christ; for it cannot be supposed that the begotten of God can be otherwise.*

This J. N. says, *lays a sufficient ground of Difference: I grant him his Difference, but not that it stands upon a firm Ground; because it confounds the distinction between the Godhead it self, and the Godhead as united with the Manhood; and tends to make void the Office of Christ, as our High-Priest and Mediator; through his Middle Nature; as well as our blessed Light and Saviour.*

In the close of this Section, J. N. appeals to me in these words, *If my Adversary has but the Understanding and Ingenuity of Man, I dare appeal to him whether he be not fairly answered, and confuted, as far as concerns this particular.* Whether I have the Understanding or Ingenuity of a Man; or no, 'tis silly in him to appeal to me, if he did not think I had; and if he did, 'twas Idle and Impertinent in him to question it; But since he has appealed to me, leaving the Judicious Reader to think as he please; I must needs give the Verdict against him. And now by all that is said by him, and quoted on this subject, from R. B. and G. K. how doth it appear that the *Quakers* are dark, Awkward, untoward, and unprincipled in the way of representing their Principle; viz. *The Light within, Thereby discrediting*, as he says, *one of the noblest Theories in the World; unless*

their manner of representing it, according to Scripture-Testimony and Language be so in his esteem and account?

That there is a difference in understanding about the Light, is manifest, I do not say in Principle, but in the Explication thereof, at least; we agree 'tis a Substance; we both profess it to be a Divine Substance; J. N. says the Quakers Represent their Light not as God himself, but (only) as a Divine Communication and Manifestation, I have already cleared this, and opposed to it our Belief of the Light, to be Christ, a Divine Substance; He goes on and says that is; *A something communicated*

or exhibited by God; The Quakers say this Something, as he calls *Page 35.* it, communicated and exhibited to us by God; is his Son; Christ Jesus; who is the Heavenly Man, or Lord from Heaven, the Second Adam, the quickening Spirit; J. N. says *he makes the Light to be the very* *Page 40.* *Essence and Substance of the Deity strictly speaking*; This must

needs be understood of the Godhead it self; and as opposed to the Quakers Faith: viz. That it is Christ the Son, distinguished from the Godhead in himself; and is in all men in a degree, and measure, but more especially in his Children and true Believers, that they also may be one in God the Father and the Son as they are one, *John 17.* I say J. N's Notion or Explication of the Light, as before mentioned, seems to be exalted above, and exclusive of Christ, in his heavenly Manhood; *who therein* is our blessed Light, and Saviour; and does not this notion plainly confound the distinction, and divide his Substance; seeing the very Essence of the Deity strictly speaking, and the Godhead it self are Synonymous Terms, and signify God as head of Christ, who as so considered, is the Anointer, and not the Anointed; for it is the Man Christ that is anointed with the Holy Spirit; and not the Word or *Logos* strictly speaking, or precisely taken; for so he is God himself, as is well observed by G. K. *Way cast up,* *Page (97.)* *For the Godhead anoints not the Godhead, but it is the Godhead that anoints the Manhood of Christ; which Manhood hath been anointed from the beginning, &c.* For so he says that Text, *Prov. 8. 23.* should be translated from the *Hebrew* Word.

Thus I think I have sufficiently explained the Quakers Principle of Light, which considered in its self is Christ the Fulness; but with respect to us, and in us, is the measure of the *Stature* of his Fullness; which to the End the *Ephesians* might come unto, the Apostle tells them, *Unto every one of us is given Grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, Ephes. 4. 7.* So we say God hath given unto every man a measure of the Light of his Son, a measure of Grace, or a measure of his Spirit; whereby Christ is in all men *Mediately*, as in a Seed; and cannot be separated from that holy pure Seed, and Light of himself; which is in all men, during the Day of their Visitation.

I have likewise duly considered J. N's Notion of the Light; and conceive as so immediately applied to man; cannot be his proper Light, because of his inaccessible and invifible brightness, far exceeding man's higheft capacity; infomuch that it is fo far from being his Natural and Ordinary way of understanding, that as fo applied to man, moft of neceffity confound him; Thus whilst he labours to exalt his Principle, he dazzles his Eyes by gazing at too great a Light: I have been the more large in treating of this fubject, feeing it to be his Bafis; and concluding to unhinge him here, would fave me the trouble of following him through every Viander of his Laberinth of expreffion, about this his repeated Notion.

I am now come to his answer to my Second Exception, *viz.* That the Quakers Represent this Light within as an extraordinary Inspiration, whence they have the name of *Enthusiasts*; He tells me, *I mistake* pag. 43. *his meaning*: I cannot help that; but if his meaning may be construed by the Genuine fence of his words, not delivered in ambiguous Terms, I am fure I no more mistake the one, then the other; What is more obvious, then that extraordinary Inspiration, is opposed to common and ordinary, or communication and manifestation (only,) in which fence I take it, and though by the Antithesis of his Article, he would repel it; yet it is plain, even from thence it must bare that fignification, because he there opposes it to his notion of the Light, to be a mans natural and ordinary way of understanding; which terms Natural and Ordinary, are opposed to Extraordinary; fo that however different his Notion is from the Quakers Principle, with respect to the Light its self: This representation of it in the name of the Quakers, as a singular and extraordinary Inspiration, is a manifest abuse, and makes good my Charge; which if he will take to himself, and fimplly own his Mistake, will have an end: But he goes on to explain his meaning, which is, says he, *That they represent it as a Supernatural Gift, or Grace; meaning by Supernatural something above, or beyond the common Order, State or Condition of Human Nature.* I answer, there is no question of it, and I most readily grant it, otherwise how should man be restored from his Laps'd estate he is in by nature; But what relation has this to Extraordinary, feeing it may be and is Common, and Universal as well as Supernatural; and the Quakers have and do declare it fo, of which I need seek no proof, because he knows it well: But here I observe how he transfers the fubject, from Extraordinary to Supernatural; doubling to alter the Sence, and quibbling to confound the Argument; and shifting upon the word Extraordinary. Again J. N. says, *The Quakers makes this Supernatural Gift, or Grace, as to its dispensation and order, to be fuch an extraordinary superabundant addition to the Nature of Man, as it is not neceffary he should always have; and without which he would still continue a Rational and intelligent Nature.* I answer, that it is an Extraordinary and

Abundant Addition to the Nature of Man, the *Quakers* believe; But that it is not necessary he should always have it, as it relates to Mans spiritual estate, and well-being; they deny: But that he may in a fence continue a Reasonable and Intelligible Nature, without the knowledge of it; they believe; viz. as it is the Light of Redemption, and Salvation; But here again the words Extraordinary, and Superabundant, as opposed to the Natural state of man; represents the quality of the Light, Gift, and Grace, but respects not the Mode or Manner of its operation, as Common and Universal; and so carries a differing signification, from the subject treated of; It is too much to trace him in all his Twistings, and turnings to avoid the Charge.

But to consider his Position a little further, I observe he reduces his notion of the Light, to the dispensation of God as Creator, which to Answer, I must distinguish from the Light of Christ as Redeemer, in the former sense I take these his following words, where to explain himself, he says, *That 'tis so much the Natural and Ordinary way of his understanding, that he could not be able to understand at all without it.* pag. 45. *that he could not only have less Light, should it be taken from him; but bequire in the dark;* With divers reiterated Expressions to the same purpose; all which argues no more, then that his Light is that which some call The remaining Light of Creation, or the Light of Nature, necessary to the very being of a reasonable and understanding Spirit as such; I do not say J. N. intends no more by it, but that it implies no more.

I confess in the purity and nobility of his Creation, *Adam* was constituted a living Soul, but when he fell from the state of Innocency he dyed, and was deprived of his divine Life and Light, in a great measure, and of the Purity of his reasonable and understanding Spirit, by which he had access to, conversed with, and enjoyed his God; Howbeit he was not totally deprived of his Reason and Understanding, but remained an intelligent Being, though much lessened and weakened, or narrowed therein; yet by the power of that Word, by which he was at first created, he was upheld in a degree of his rational Life, and Powers, suitable to his degraded estate and condition of Human Life; so that he could not be said to be altogether without the Light of his Creation; in which sense I understand J. N's notion of his Light to be true. *viz.* That without it we should not only not see so well, but be able to see nothing, or not at all; that is to say, we should not only cease to be reasonable Creatures, but cease to be at all; But how does he thereby exalt his Light, seeing as thus stated and considered in its natural consequences; It must needs have Relation to the Remains of our Natural Understanding by, and not of our Supernatural Light of Redemption and Restoration, by Christ Jesus the second *Adam*, the Lord from Heaven, the quickening Spirit, which indeed is such an extraordinary super-

superaddition to Human Nature, as may be rightly termed Grace; and which man as considered in his fallen and degenerate estate, might be, and is without receiving, and enjoying it by Faith, and yet be, and does remain, a reasonable and understanding Spirit, or a Rational and Intelligent Nature; which is expressly contrary to his notion of the Light, as he has stated it.

But to proceed, J. N. takes another Turn for it, to prove the Quakers Represent this Light within, as a sort of Extraordinary Inspiration; He says, *That plain, that they make this Internal Light to be Grace, that special and peculiar Grace of Christ, whereby he restores Laps'd man from the Corruption of his Natural State*; for this end he quotes out of R. B's *Apol* pag. 330. *God hath communicated and given to every man a measure of the Light of his Son, a measure of Grace, or a measure of his Spirit*; and again out of R. B. pag. 346. *where he calls it a Supernatural Gift, and Grace of Christ.*

1016 Pag. 460. What does J. N. infer from all this, *Not that he would be thought to deny the Divine Light to be Grace, at so certain degrees of it*: What then? Is it Grace in one degree, and not in another? What stuff is here; he should have settled and distinguished his Degrees, that we might have known how to judge of them; surely one might think this Man would make the knowledge of the Gospel, Truths, if not the way to Heaven it self, such a Labyrinth, as is fit only for such as be of notional complexion, or have their Heads cast in a Metaphysical Mould, (as he expresses himself on another occasion) to find out; or who can be tamely given up, to follow his Clue whether they see it or no.

But he goes on and says, *That he is so far from that, (viz.) denying the Divine Light to be Grace, at so certain degrees of it*; That he thinks it to be the greatest Grace of God; that is, he says, *with respect to the degrees of it*; Many of which I allow to be such Extraordinary superadditions to the common order or state of Human Nature; as man might simply be without, and yet continue in the rank and form of a Reasonable and Intelligent Creature.

Here J. N. still leaves us in the dark, what sort of Grace his Light is; and in what degrees and measures it is so; he hath a little before opposed it to that Grace the Quakers make their Principle of Internal Light to be, viz. That special and peculiar Grace of Christ, whereby he restores Laps'd man from the Corruption of his Natural state; consequently we may justly infer he intends not that; and therefore whatever else he intends, does not signify much: but if his Preaching be no better then such his Writing, 'twere better he held his peace, for any good such Doctrine will do.

But he goes further, *The Quakers not content with this, make the Divine Light to be Grace simply and absolutely, as to its whole Nature and Kind so as to be all over Extraordinary*; Do they so? And is that their fault? and the sum

of all reduced to this; I profess I think they do well to make it so, in this
 sense of the word Extraordinary; viz. Superaddition to the state of Hu-
 man Nature in the Fall; for in so doing, they give the honour of all to
 Christ Jesus, who is this Divine Light and Grace, in the account and
 esteem of the Quakers; Though I cannot perceive it to be so in his account,
 upon the foot of his Notion, as he hath explained it; for that Christ in
 his whole Nature and Kind, if I may so express my self, is the Grace of God
 to man, and all over Extraordinary; full of Grace, and full of Truth;
 here the word Extraordinary, hath still relation to the quality of the
 Light, Gift and Grace, and not as opposed to common or universal in
 its manifestation, as I have observed before; so that it proves nothing of
 his Assertion, wherein I Charge him of misrepresenting the Quakers Prin-
 ciple: Here we may see what a mean and narrow shift J. N. is driven to,
 to exalt his Principle of the Light; and to debase and expose the Quakers,
 that when all is done, he makes his Light to be the Grace of God, but as
 to certain degrees of it undiscovered; and that not the special and pecu-
 liar Grace of Christ neither; and the Quakers make it to be so, viz. the
 peculiar Grace of Christ in its whole Nature and Kind.

J. N. proceeds on the same Argument, viz. *That the Quakers*
do make the Light something Extraordinary, that is something added Pag. (47,
to the common way of Understanding; so as not to be simply necessary to 48.)
Understanding in general, but only to the greater advantage of it, by which, he
says, their Principle is set at a sufficient distance from his. I perceive he is fond
 of his Distance now, and is very exact in keeping it; he need not be
 afraid, the Quakers will not run away with his new Notion of the Light;
 he may keep it for any excellency they see in it; I have already granted him
 his Difference, and owned this Distinction, and answered it; so that what
 he quotes out of R. B's *Apol.* serves only to support his distance, and re-
 quires no farther notice, then a bare recital of it, being unquestionably sound
 and true; and was opposed to a common Calumny; viz. That the Quakers
 preached up a Natural Light, or the Light of mans Natural Conscience.

It is as followeth, 'That man, as he is a Rational Creature,
 hath reason as a natural faculty of his Soul, by which he discerns Apoll. pag.
 things that are Rational, we deny not, for this is a property 337.
 Natural and Essential to him, by which he can know and learn many Arts
 and Sciences, beyond what any other Animal can do, by the meer Animal
 Principle. Neither do we deny but by this Rational Principle, man may
 apprehend in his Brain, and in the notion a knowledge of God, and Spi-
 ritual things, yet that not being the right Organ as in the second Pro-
 position, hath more at length been signified, it cannot profit him towards
 Salvation, but rather hindereth; and indeed the great cause of the Apo-
 stacy, hath been that man hath sought to fathom the things of God in

‘and by this Natural and Rational Principle; and to build up a Religion
 ‘in it, neglecting and over-looking this Principle, and Seed of God in
 ‘the Heart, so that herein, in the most universal and catholick sense, hath
 ‘Antichrist in every man set up himself, and sitteth in the Temple of God
 ‘as God; and above every thing that is called God; for *Men bring the Temple*
 ‘*of the Holy Ghost*, as saith the Apostle, 1 Cor. 3. 16. When the Rati-
 ‘onal Principle sets it self up there, above the Seed of God, to reign and
 ‘rule, as a Prince, in Spiritual things, while the holy Seed is wounded
 ‘and bruised, there is Antichrist in every man, or somewhat exalted above
 ‘and against Christ, &c. I have been the more large in this quotation,
 from the occasion given of J. N.’s making use of part of it, considering the
 weight of the subject, with an Eye to a general Service, and in particu-
 lar recommended to the serious and unprejudiced thoughts of my Adver-
 sary, apprehending it greatly concerns him, in which I express my good
 will and desire of his welfare.

J. N. quotes the same Author again to the same purpose,
 Apoll. pag. 346. where R. B. treating of the Divine Light, argues, It cannot
 be any of the Natural Gifts or Faculties of our Soul, where-
 by we are said to be enlightened, according to the *1st of John*,
 vers. 9. because this Light is said to shine in Darkness, and cannot be
 comprehended by it, *John* 1. 5. Now says he, This Darkness is no other
 but mans Natural condition and state, in which Natural state he can easily
 comprehend, and doth comprehend those things that are peculiar and com-
 mon to him as such; that man in his Natural condition is called Darkness,
 see *Ephes.* 5. 8. For ye were sometimes Darkness, but now are ye Light in the Lord.
 And in other places, as *Acts* 26. 18. *Coll.* 1. 13. *1 Thes.* 5. 5. where the
 condition of man in his Natural state is termed Darkness: Therefore I
 say this Light cannot be any Natural property or faculty of mans Soul,
 but a Supernatural Gift, and Grace of Christ. Thus far R. B. Well then,
 though it be granted that the *Quakers* believe the Divine Light to be an Ac-
 cession to the Understanding of depraved lost man, it will not thence follow
 that it is not the object of Human Understanding, because they do not make
 it the very Essence of God strictly speaking, as J. N. would infer;
 no more than that the Sun should not be the object of our sight,
 and subject of our feeling, when we behold its glorious Light, and feels
 the warm Influences of its Beams upon the face of our Earth, because we
 cannot steadfastly behold its glorious brightness Eye to Eye, by reason of the
 weakness of our sight, nor endure the too near approaches of its excessive
 heat, by reason of our mixed Constitution: Nor will it follow hence, that
 allowing this measure of Light to be an advantageous Medium between the
 Fulness and us, That it is not at the same time the proper object, and Light
 of the Soul; as the Sun shining through the Air is to the Eye, by and
 through

through which we clearly see and behold the things of this material and visible World; and so I conclude my Answer to his 48. and part of 49. pages.

The next thing in question, is the Contradiction I assign upon him, for which he says, *he very much admires the quickness of my Eye* (p. 49.) *fight*; but I can with more truth say, he hath given me greater cause to admire his shifting to avoid it; The matter is this, first he says, *The Quakers usually talk of the Light within, as of some Divine Communication and Manifestation (only;)* And immediately within the compass of five Lines, says, *The Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of Extraordinary Inspiration, whence they have the name of Enthusiasts;* Whereupon I query, is not Extraordinary more, then Common, or Communication and Manifestation (only;) I have already shewed the contradiction between Common or Ordinary, and Extraordinary, upon his own Antithesis: Now it remains to be considered, what this Extraordinary Inspiration is, whence the Quakers, as he says, have the Name of Enthusiasts; and which they represent this Light to be; That the common acceptation of the word *Enthusiasts*, and as by him applyed to the Quakers; bares an ill sense, is evident, for that he takes occasion thereby to fault their Principle of the Light; the most common and natural sense then of the matter amounts to no less, then some new and Immediate Revelations; which the Quakers pretends to, above other men, by the singular and extraordinary inspiration of the Light within; which agrees with that other passage in his Postscript, recited in p. 23. 4th Article, viz. *The Quakers make their Light within a special Privilege of a certain Order of Men, their own party, &c.* And this sense of his expression is not strained; but the natural consequence of the words, and amounts to a most hainous abuse, and which being compared with his Assertion in his first Article, pag. 22. viz. That the Quakers usually talk of this Light within, as of some Divine Communication and Manifestation (only;) I think is contrariety and contradiction enough, viz. as much as is between Ordinary and Extraordinary; seeing to profess the Light as a Divine Communication and Manifestation (only) must be in his account, to profess it modestly, and in common, though inferior to his notion; and to profess it in the other sense, viz. as Extraordinary Inspiration, from whence they have the Name of *Enthusiasts*, is to profess it in a peculiar and singular way, not only above the Right and privilege of other men, but as conceited and whimsical; and so I shall proceed to take notice, how he labours to avoid this consequence by shifting on the word extraordinary.

J. N. still contriving his escape, queries, *What if Extraordinary be more then Common, or Communication and Manifestation (only;) does it therefore contradict it? What is every Addition a Contradiction?* page. (50.)

He answers himself, *It may indeed be so, in case the degree added in the second Proposition, were denyed, and excluded in the first.* I answer, this is plainly the case, not barely with respect to the word (*only*) but from the Contrariety of the Proposition it self, and this I will evince by his own instance; (*Suppose, says he, Adam had persevered in his Original state, and his whole Posterity had inherited that Extraordinary Grace, that frenum Justitiæ, which according to some was superadded to the Essential Perfection of his Human Nature, would it have been the less Extraordinary, that is the less superaddition to the Nature of Adam.*) I answer no, in that sence of the word Extraordinary, which by this instance is varied from uncommon, or universal, in which sence it would have been less Extraordinary; and transferred, as in page 44. to Supernatural; so here to the superadded quality of the Grace, in which latter sence of the word Extraordinary, the question is not concerned, which I prove thus; The Extraordinary Inspiration he says the *Quakers* represent the Light to be; is such it seems, as from whence they have the name of Enthusiasts; This sort of Extraordinary Inspiration is assigned on the *Quakers*, as their fault, and Error; in opposition to that Ordinary, and Common, yet Holy Inspiration; all are exhorted to pray for by the Lithurgy of the Church of England, viz. some new, singular and extraordinary Inspiration, in a fantastical sence, which extreemly differs from Extraordinary, as applied to supernatural, or superadded quality of the Grace; and being considered in the proper sence of the word, viz. as opposed to Common and Ordinary, as I have already proved it must be, from the assigned error on the *Quakers*, and so compared with the former Position, or Article, of making the Light within to be a Divine Communication and Manifestation (*only*) by his leave, is a palpable Contradiction, as well as a gross Misrepresentation of the *Quakers* Principle; Thus I have traced him through his tedious Laberinth, where I never saw any thing so mist and twist its self, to escape; for which I more admire his Wit and Skill, then his Candor and Plainness, and wherein I have doubled and reiterated any matter in this his Reply, his repeated Exceptions have been the occasion of it.

J. N. objects to my Construction of some Words of his, they are as follow; *I suppose it, viz. The Light within to be a mans Na-* (pag. 53)
tural and Ordinary way of Understanding; And I observe that just before me he made *It to be the very Essence and Substance of the Deity,* which are his express words; again by these words, a mans Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding; I take him to intend the same thing as in pag. (77.) *Reflect.* &c. where he calls the *Divine Logos* or Light within, Reason and Conscience; *This is Reason, this is Conscience;* His words are plain and positive, and need no other Construction then what they necessarily will, and must bare; and if they be unsound, and not rightly expressive of his sence and meaning,

meaning; he must blame himself for that, and not me for shewing the confusion, and self-contradiction they manifest; But if he will allow himself to make use of, not only ill suited, but opposite terms; which one would think a man of his Logical head should not do; and then think it sufficient to say, *he did not mean so*; who can help it, whatever his meaning was, it is plain by his words that he made his notion of the Divine Light, to be the very same thing with Human Understanding, confounding it with mans Reason and Conscience: But it is so grievous to J. N. to be taken in a plain and literal sence, and thereby to be reprehended, as confused and erroneous in his Principle of the Light; And can he think it Justifiable in himself, to mischaracterize, and misrepresent a whole Society of People, and their Principle, from mistaken inferences of his own; grounded upon such strained, and remote consequences, as is perfectly Injurious to the express sence and design of the Author he quotes, as I shall have occasion to manifest at large, he hath dis-ingeniously done by R. B.

But let us consider this Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding, which he opposes to the *Quakers* representing their Light as superadded to mans natural way of understanding in the fall: by this Phrase, (*way*) I perceive he intends the means, by which we understand, which means, as it has relation to spiritual and divine knowledge Man dyed to; for in the first *Adam* all died, and became seperated from it, through Sin and Transgression; consequently the Divine Light was no longer his natural and ordinary way of understanding in that sence; poor fallen and degenerated man, having instead thereof, sucked in another spirit and wisdom, and knowledge from the Serpent, to which he gave up the exercise of his rational Powers, and Life; Now the question is, how can man, thus lost, and undone, come to be redeemed & restored out of this miserable estate of nature in the fall, wherein he is both deprived of the principle of his divine knowledge, and of the primitive Purity of his reasonable & understanding Spirit, in his first Creation; but in and by the work of the new Creation, which is alone effected by Christ Jesus, the promised Seed, the Second *Adam*, the Lord from Heaven, the quickening Spirit; which promised Seed, was foretold should bruise the Serpents Head; And this is Superadditonal, as well as Supernatural Grace; otherwise man had perished, and that without remedy; and this is absolutely necessary, to a Spiritual Life and Divine Understanding; nevertheless man may have, and that in a true sence to, a large understanding and apprehension of things in his Brain without its immediate guidance, which renders his notion of the Light, *viz.* That it is so much the natural and ordinary way of mans understanding, that there is no understanding without it, unsafe to be said absolutely; because without it, that is to say without the sence and feeling of its divine operation upon the Soul; to influence and illuminate it, man, whilst dead to God

God may be alive in the corrupt nature, feeding upon the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil; though it be granted, That as this Divine Light is Christ the Word, by whom are all things; and he in and through all things; and by him all things consist; Col. 1. 17. Man cannot strictly be said to be without it in that sense, though he may in the other, viz. as he is sent forth from the Bosom of the Father to be mans Light and Saviour, in this sense the Scripture makes mention of some that lived without God in the world; and contrary to this is not to be inferred from any thing R. B. hath written that I know of.

J. N. in his answer to my third Exception justifies his Position, and tells me: if he were to new cast it, it should be in the same Mould; it is thus: *If I mistake not, the Quakers confine their Light within to some certain objects, namely Moral and Spiritual Truths, in order (only) to the direction of Practice:* To prove this, he quotes a passage out R. B's *Apol.* pag. 337. viz. 'As God gave two great Lights to rule the outward World, the Sun and Moon, the greater Light to rule the Day, and the lesser Light to rule the Night; so hath he given man the Light of his Son, a spiritual & Divine Light, to rule him in things Spiritual, and the Light of Reason to rule him in things Natural: Hence I grant it is plain, That there are two Lights in the Soul, viz. the Divine Light, and the natural, or the Light of Reason. But is this an error, surely no, if it be, why does he not disprove it? But he says it confirms what was said in the last Section concerning the Quakers making the Divine Light an extraordinary communication, that is superaccessary to the natural Light, &c. Does it so? it confirms then what no Quaker ever denied, that I know of: But that other inference of his, viz. That mans Natural Light, or Light of Reason, remained intire, though seperated from the Divine Light, I deny; for though it was not totally extinguished, it was weakened, veiled and corrupted; and as for its being a principle wholly distinct from the Light, if he means with respect to its existance, I deny it; but if with respect to operation, whilst remaining in its degeneration and corruption; I grant it is distinct, and stands upon another bottom, viz. the Serpent's Spirit and wisdom; and so I have answered that part of his Inference, as being not deducible from his quotation.

But to prove the Quakers confine the Light within, &c. He argues *these two Lights can no more interser with one anothers order, then the Sun can usurp the Government of the Night; or the Moon assume to herself the conduct of the Day; and if this be not to confine the Divine Light to some certain objects, namely Moral and Spiritual Truths, I know not what it is.*

Here lest the Reader should think this construction to be R. B's sense, or deducible from his foregoing words; what doubtless J. N. designedly avoided, I shall do, viz. repeat his following words, which are these; *And even*

as the Moon borrows her Light from the Sun, so ought men if they would be rightly and comfortably ordered in Natural things, to have their Reason Enlightened by this Divine and pure Light. Thus J. N. abuses his ingenious Author, not only concealing, but perverting his sense; but to consider the matter a little further; will his Conclusion hold? is his Consequence upon the first part of his quotation fairly, and equally applyed? doubtless he knows the contrary, though he catches at any thing to serve his purpose; Will he not consider the disparity of the subjects? their disproportion with respect to their primitive station and order, because men usually illustrate matters, by comparing visible to Invisible, or created to Divine things, will he thence infer a necessity that if it be allowable in a comparison, it must hold good in all its relations; as in a case where there is no inequality in the subjects; Because the Quakers say there are two Lights in the Soul, compared to the Sun and Moon, which are created and limited beings, and have their distinct and limited offices; that therefore the Quakers by such their comparison, confine the Light within, which is supernatural, and divine, to some certain objects, namely Moral and Spiritual Truths: What a far-fetched and unlearned Consequence this man makes? and in the end 'twill not serve his turn; God made man upright, created him in his Image, breathed into him the breath of Life, and so he became a living Soul, in a Divine, Rational or Intellectual, and Animal life, to his divine Life he dyed, and was separated from it by transgression, which divine Life was to him, as the Light of the Sun to the Day; this Light being extinguished as to him, he fell into Darkness, and an evitable Night came over him; The remaining Light of his Creation, viz. his intellectual and rational principle, whereby Man is distinguished from other Animals, was not hereby totally Extinguished, (though greatly veiled, darkened, and corrupted by the Serpent's power and spirit, that entered it;) But under this degeneracy, remained as a conduct through his Animal Life, this poor undone man not only lost the Light of his glorious Sun; but had his Moon eclipsed; what follows, and how comes man, that was in honour, and abode not, but became like the Beast that perisheth; to be restored again; but by the superaddition of this divine Light, to his miserable estate, which was the promised Seed; which though extinguished, and as a Lamb slain by mans transgression; remained nevertheless in the purity of its own life, living to God; and him it pleased God in the riches of his Love, and infinite compassion to the works of his own Hands, to send forth again, out of his own Bosom, to effect the work of the new Creation, viz. the Redemption and Restoration of lost man again to God; Thus he came to be quickened and made alive, to have his spiritual Sences restored again, and not only so, but to have his rational powers rectified, or his Moon-Light renewed and delivered from under the power of the Serpent's spirit and wisdom which had corrupted it.

Now

Now the question upon this Article is, whether *Robert Barclay* hath by his aforementioned comparison limited or confined the Divine Light, to some certain objects, Namely, Moral or Spiritual Truths; or that he confines the Light as much to such objects as the Sun is confined to the Day; which is *J. N.*'s positive assertion, because the divine Light is the principle of our spiritual Sences, and divine Knowledge; and therefore compared to the Sun, that rules the Day; will it thence follow because the Sun cannot interfer with the office of the Moon, or the Moon of the Sun, both keeping their proper station and order; that the Moon does not receive Light from the Sun; or that the Son of Righteousness is equally confined, and have nothing to do with the natural and created Light of mans corrupted Reason, to help purifie and renew it; surely this is as ill, and unsound in Doctrine, as it is unlearned, and unfair in consequence.

J. N. might here have spared his Reflection on me on this occasion, having sufficiently exposed himself, in reproaching me, and largely manifested his defect of Civillity, and good Behaviour, in the fore part of his Treatise.

But he goes on, having pickt up one passage more out of the Preface to *R. B.*'s Works. pag. 21. which he thinks may serve his turn. The words are, (speaking of his *Apol.* for the true Christian Divinity) *The method and stile of the Book may be somewhat singular, and like a Schollar; for we make that sort of Learning no part of our divine Science:* Which *J. N.* says comes to as much as if he had said, we make Human Learning or those pag. (63.) Arts and Sciences, which are the common objects of Accademical learning, no part of that knowledge which is supernaturally communicated to us by the Light of Christ Jesus. Thus far *J. N.* is right, and I allow of his stating the Position; but he errs in framing his Argument on the consequence, which he does thus; *If Human Learning be no part of that Knowledge, which comes by the divine Light, then the divine Light is not extended to Human Learning, and consequently must be confined to Spiritual Truths;* I deny the second Position, as being differently stated upon his first sumption; To say that Human Learning in the Preface's words, is no part of our divine Science, or in *J. N.*'s words to the same effect, That it is not supernaturally communicated to us by the Light of Christ, is one thing; and to say that Human Learning is no part of that Knowledge, which comes by the divine Light is another thing; the difference lies in the manner of communication, and Organ of Reception: Though the *Quakers* pretend not to the ordinary knowledge of necessary Arts and Sciences, by the supernatural communication of the divine Light; yet they do not say they come not by the divine Light, by whom are all things, and in whom are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge: but the *Quakers* distinguish and confess the Divine Light is extensive to universal Truth, according to that Text

of the Apostle to the *Corinthians*, *The Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*, different in its mode, and manner of its operation; with respect to the different nature of the knowledge, and subjects it works upon; making use in each of its proper Organ, *viz.* the Spiritual Senses of the Soul, which have their root, Life and being, in a measure of this divine Light, for the divine Knowledge of heavenly things; and the inferior faculty of the Soul; *viz.* the rational and intellectual Power, for the knowledge of human and natural things; Though I do not hereby deny, but God has and may supernaturally convey to some men, the certain knowledge of some necessary human Arts and Sciences, and such their Knowledge is divine and extraordinary.

But J. N. takes a great deal of pains to improve this his mistaken Proposition, and would needs have the *Quakers* principle naturally to lead them to it, because they conceive and represent this Divine Light to be that very Grace of Christ; whereby men are converted and saved, quoting R. B. again in the 5th and 6th Propositions, *pag. 317.* where reckoning up the ends, and purposes for which this saving and spiritual Light was given by God; Makes them consist in making manifest all things that are reprobable, in teaching all Repentance, Righteousness and Godliness, and in general enlightning the hearts of all in order to Salvation; I think this is a very good account of the Light; But what would J. N. infer from *pag. (64.)* this; Why he says it seems this Light then is (*purely*) in order to Salvation; by the word *purely*, I take him to intend (*only*) and consequently he says, That it ought to be confined to divine and spiritual Truths, in order to the direction of Life, and Manners; But how can he make this to be the consequence of R. B's Proposition? does he not herein, as well as in his former quotations, manifestly abuse his Ingenious Author, prevaricating, and straining his sense to a Remote consequence; his words do no ways reach: But for want of proof, he presumes, and says, *why they do thus confine their Light, to spiritual things; so they ought thus to confine it; for what has Grace to do with the things of Nature?* a fine way of argument; to which there needs not be more said, then reverting of it (*viz.*) As the *Quakers* do not confine the Divine Light, (*purely*) or (*only*) to spiritual things; so they ought not thus to confine it, for Grace has to do with things of Nature. The Spirit searcheth all things; and is that Wisdom that knoweth and understandeth all things; when the Earth was drowned with the flood, who directed the course of the Righteous in a piece of Wood of small value; It may be read at large how Solomon ascribes all Knowledge to this Wisdom, *book of Wisdom, cap. 7.* What though (as J. N. expresses himself) he does not conceive this internal Light as any thing superadded to the ordinary way of mans understanding, nor after the manner of Grace, neither, as to its

simple kind; though it may be said, have that elevation in some of its degrees; if the holy Scripture teach the truth, *Whom shall we believe, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, said Christ, who is full of Grace, and full of Truth; Grace and Truth came by him, John 1. 16. was not this superadded not only to the Law of Moses; but to the ordinary way of mans understanding, the Grace of God which brings in salvation, hath appeared unto all men, &c. Tit. 2. 11.*

In confirmation of this Doctrine, that the Internal Light is not any thing superadded to the ordinary way of mans understanding, I have opposed already *Adams* deprivation in the fall; the many and months of his restoration; That as in *Adam* all died, so also the Gift, by Grace, which is by one Man, *Jesus Christ*, hath abounded unto many, *Rom. 5. 15.* Here it is to be observed, that it was by the free Gift of Grace, that man was to be restored, and not by any Remains of Light in his fallen Nature, as pertaining thereto, and as capable to give him divine knowledge in spiritual things; seeing every Imagination of the thoughts of his Heart was evil, and that continually; thus by many and months, and fresh visitation of Life, and superaddition of Grace; *By Graces workes said, none only offer, it is the gift of God; wherein Sin abounded, Grace did much more abound, Rom. 5. 20.*

In opposition to my making the Light to be divine, supernatural and un-circumscribable, in which are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, *Col. 2. 3.* *J. N.* objects to the latter, because we make it a certain middle nature, between God and man, consequently in his esteem not inestimable; and the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge not applicable to it, because; I have already showed what this middle Nature, or Mediator between God and man is; viz. the man *Christ Jesus*, *1st Phil. 2. 3.* the begotten of God, and of his proper substance; It is said, *It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, Col. 1. 19.* Again, *John 1. 16.* Of his fulness have all men received Grace for Grace; this man is upon a dangerous pinnacle, in that he will not allow *Christ Jesus* our Divine Light, one of the attributes of his Divinity, because we do not profess him to be in us, as he is in himself, (viz.) the very Essence and Substance of the Deity strictly speaking; which implies the fulness of the Godhead as is before observed; but that we partake of the measure of his fulness, according to the aforementioned Scripture; which measure is not separated from him, but united in him with his fulness; no more then the different measures of the Light of the Sun, is separated from the body or fulness of the Sun.

Again, *J. N.* opposes my saying the Quakers have testified and declared the Light and Spirit of Truth are one and the same in being, which will glide into all Truth, *John 1. 9. 13.* as a contradiction to their belief of *Christ* their Light concerning his middle Nature, or Being;

Being; betwixt God and man; insinuating that, Though the Spirit of Truth be really and truly God; that they testify against themselves, and declare contradictions in making the Light to be one and the same with the Spirit of Truth; and that then he says, 'tis no great matter what they testify and declare: To which I answer, this is a general Reflection and charge, upon his own mistaken consequence concerning Christ the Light, as he is a Middle Nature, or Being, supposing this middle nature, or Being, to be a distinct or divided Substance, from Christ, consequently not of the proper substance or nature of God; but some created, or material substance; wherein he injuriously infers in his Appendix, that the *Quakers* Light is a Creature, and a Material Creature; He may, as well say that Christ is so too, because the *Quakers* most firmly believe he is that true Light, which Light-eth every Man that cometh into the world, *John* 1. 9.

I have already shewed that though Christ has a Two-fold Nature united in Substance, by taking the Manhood into God, whereby he became a middle nature and mediator betwixt God and man; His substance is not thereby divided, but remains united with the proper substance and essence of God; But though Christ be not divided in substance from the Godhead, he hath proportioned himself through his heavenly Manhood; and hath given to every man a measure of Light, and a measure of Grace, a measure of the Spirit, *Eph.* 4. 7. which is the Seed of the Kingdom sown in all sorts of Ground or mens Hearts, and Christ Jesus is that great and heavenly Seeds-man, or sower that went forth to sow, *Luke* 8. Now this measure of Light, Grace, and Spirit, and Seed, though proportioned to us, and in us, is not divided from Christ, as Christ is not divided from God: And though it be not the very Essence, and Substance of the Deity strictly speaking, or the Godhead it self precisely taken; yet it is a degree, consequently a part, and portion of him; and for that reason of his proper Substance; not divided, but inseparably united with him, and in him, as the Beams of the Sun are with the intire Body of the Sun; This Divine Light being thus manifested, and acknowledged by the *Quakers* to be Christ, measureably conveyed, and given to men, and of his proper Substance; It must needs be one and the same with the Spirit of Truth, because Christ is so revealed in Spirit as plainly appears *Joh* 16. consequently no Creature, or Material Creature, as J. N. represents it; but a divine and immaterial Substance, wherein he is guilty of a most heinous presumption, and defamation of the *Quakers* Principle of the Divine Light, to the great dishonour of God.

And seeing J. N. confesses the *Quakers* make their Light to be the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Flesh and Blood that came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints feed, and are nourished up unto Eternal Life, quoting these words out of *R. B.* And

Appl. pag.
393.

seeing he also confesses, that there may be such a thing, as the Spiritual Body of Christ, distinct from the Natural, according to the 6th of John, which he says favours it not a little, *Appendix, pag. 16. and 17.*; and farther seeing it is plain, by the same Scripture from *verf. 48. to 63.* that the Bread of Life, which came down from Heaven; and the Spiritual Body, or Flesh and Blood of Christ, is Christ; and that it is Spirit and Life; surely then it must needs be granted, to be an Immaterial or Increated substance; hence it is the *Quakers* make the Light and Spirit of Truth one and the same in Being; consequently J. N. in making the *Quakers* principle of the Light thus considered, and by him acknowledged, to be held by the *Quakers*, to be a Creature, and a material Creature, is to make Christ, his Spirit and Life, so too; which is not only a wilful abuse of the *Quakers*, but a gross piece of Blasphemy, and this is that monstrous Birth he hath brought forth, and recommended to a great many of the learned world, as a considerable piece of News, for which let him blush for shame, and repent.

But J. N. has another Turn about the confinement of the Light, which he would fain fasten upon the *Quakers* principle; or contradiction on me; which he hath given his verdict is my doom; his way and manner is, to make the *Quakers* and me say what he please; though we say, and intend the contrary, and then fall a buffeting us for that we never said, or thought; but let us examine the matter; I say the *Quakers* believe the Divine Light to be the quickener of their understandings to know; and of their wills to love and practice all truth; and that it doth assist the natural faculties of the Soul, in the attaining of necessary Arts and Sciences; But how is this consistent, says J. N. with what he says in the beginning of his Book, where he calls this corrupt Wisdom, and the forbidden Fruit; and what will prove folly in the end; and the wisdom that is below; and that which God's wisdom from above, ever did and will confound. Answer, I positively deny his Assertion, and return it upon him as a down right Fallhood; and have already taken notice of it as such in the fore part of this Reply; Human Learning, and the attainment of necessary Arts and Sciences, simply considered, is not corrupt wisdom, &c. though man may corrupt himself in the misuse, or abuse of it; But the un sanctified Wit and Reason of the unregenerate man, which would exalt it self to act and judge, about divine and supernatural things, as I have said before; and I may add in the foregoing words of his quotation, where I make it to be the high Notions, and self-conceited Imaginations, in mans way, which is out of the Way of God; and which I say his Wisdom ever did; and will confound. Now if it be so, as most certainly it is, a false Charge; his treatment thereof must be of necessity, a most abusive sort of Sophistry; It runs thus, See the Inconsistency and Unfincerity of this Writer; when he would serve his turn to beat down and disparage Human Learning,

Learning, then 'tis corrupt Wisdom, forbidden Fruit, and I know not what: and when he had another Turn to serve (that is to contradict me) then this Wisdom as corrupt as it is, is taught us by the instruction of the Divine Light; are the Divine Light and divine Wisdom at such defiance with each other? But this Mr. Vickris is at defiance with himself, and I am afraid will not easily be reconciled; for if the divine Light teaches this sort of Wisdom, then 'tis not corrupt; which contradicts what he said in the other place: and if this sort of Wisdom be corrupt, then the Divine Light does not teach it, as being a pure and clean Principle; and such as cannot consent to any Evil or Wickedness, which is manifestly what he says here; so that either way contradiction is his Doom.

But what if his Proposition and Charge be a falshood, as I have already challenged him it is; will not his argument be fallacious and sophistical too; and instead of contradiction to be my Doom; will not, what is worse, a most abusive prevarication be his; I am sure he cannot escape this sentence; the whole matter is so plain and obvious, depending upon the truth or falseness of the Charge, the latter of which I affirm him to be guilty of; so need no argument to illustrate it.

The next thing I charge J. N. with as an abuse of the Quakers principle is, that he says, *They make the Light within a supplement to Scripture, which they say is not sufficient without it, nor indeed any more than a meer dead Letter*; This he says, was not either intended or used by him as a direct and particular objection against the Quakers.

Perhaps with relation to the first part of it he might not so intend it; so shall pass it by here; But the latter part seems to have a very ill tendency, and Reflection upon them, which compared with his false Position in his former Article, pag. 22. viz. *The Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of extraordinary Inspiration, from whence they have the name of Enthusiasts*; which as applied to the Quakers, bares an ill sense, and signifies pretenders to new fantastical and immediate Inspirations; not common to other men; as I have before observed, whence People might be induced to believe the Quakers, to be indeed despisers of the holy Scripture, as a meer dead Letter; which words he may take back as his own, and not the Quakers, since he does not so much as offer at any proof for them; My Charge in this Article extends not only to his rendering the Quakers contemptuous of the holy Scriptures; but singular and erroneous in their principle of the Light, and the holy Scriptures, as useful to all but themselves; which I prove thus: J. N. represents the Quakers to say the Scriptures is no more than a meer dead Letter, without the Light.

2dly, This Light within he says in his second Article the Quakers represent, as an extraordinary Inspiration, whence they have the name of Enthusiasts. 3dly, In his 4th Article he says, the Quakers make this Light within a special Privilege of a certain order of men, their own party, making none

but those of their own Way to be actually enlightned by it. Hence it will inevitably follow, upon this treble supposition, that he represents the *Quakers* as is before mentioned, contrary to their known, constant, and long professed Faith, and Doctrine; J. N. grants the Consequence, but then to avoid the matter; objects to the Proposition in his 4th Article, pag. (72.) That it was not absolutely charged upon the *Quakers* by him. Here he betakes himself to a very mean shift; The Article is positive, in the words before recited, his distinction between possibility, and actually (of which I shall have occasion to treat more particularly hereafter) will not make void, but rather enforce his Charge; neither will his shifting upon the word Extraordinary help him, because this double Proposition will carry it; viz. 1st; That the *Quakers* say the Scriptures are a dead Letter without the Light. 2dly, That this Light, with respect to its actual Illumination is their own peculiar privilege.

Hence it is that I charged J. N. with a down-right falsity, viz. That the *Quakers* make their Light within a special privilege of a certain order of men, their own party; not indeed as to the possibility; yet they do as to the act, making none but those of their own way to be actually enlightned by it. These are his own words; by the way in his answer to my Objections to his former Article, he made the *Quakers* to confine the Light within to things, viz. some certain objects, namely Moral and Spiritual Truths; and then it was his plea that he never said absolutely, and simply, that the *Quakers* confine the Light within, which as he observes would imply a confinement to Persons, that plea or shift must henceforth be out of doors with him; for he plainly asserts now, and so he did before, that they confine it to certain men, or men of a certain order, viz. their own party, as to the Act of Illumination; and I think that confinement sufficient to exclude all others from the means of partaking or enjoying of it. To prove this, he takes up two pages to state his meaning, but he might have saved himself the trouble being plain, and I take him in his own sense, viz. Actual Illumination; and then he forms the following Argument. They that do exclude all Men that are in their Natural and corrupt estate, from the Actual Illumination of the Divine Light, do confine the Divine Light as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate; But the *Quakers* do exclude all men that are in their natural and corrupt estate, from the Actual Illumination of the Divine Light; therefore, the *Quakers* do confine the Divine Light as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate. The first of these Propositions I grant is most evident; but the great question is, how he will prove his second; upon which all depends, and the argument turns; He assumes his proposition again, upon the like presumption and resolves all into this; that the *Quakers* do exclude all men that are in their natural and corrupt estate; from any sensation or feeling of the Divine

Divine Light; therefore the *Quakers* do exclude all men that are in their natural and corrupt estate, from the actual Illumination of the Divine Light; and this he says he believes, he can render not only exceeding probable, but demonstrate; which I say must be determined not by argument only, but by proof. But by the way let it be observed, this argument, if it be proved, will not reach to maintain his assertion, and clear him from the Charge of falshood, viz. That the *Quakers* confine the Light within to a certain order of men, their own party; making none but those of their own way to be actually enlightned by it, unless he could have proved at the same time, that the *Quakers* had made all men to have been in their natural and corrupt estate, except their own party; and they only to be the Regenerate; wherein his argument falls short; and if it did not, and his proof were defective, 'twould issue in the same, viz. an abusive false charge; But let us hear what proof he brings to support his argument.

The first instance J. N. quotes in order to this is out of R. B's *Apol.* pag. 310. The words are, *All Adam's Posterity, or mankind, both Jews and Gentiles, as to the first Adam (or Earthly man) is fallen, degenerated and dead [i.e. and so far] deprived of the sensation, or feeling of this Inward Testimony, or Seed of God, and is subject unto the power, nature, and seed of the Serpent, which he sows in mens Hearts, while they abide in this natural and corrupt estate, from whence it comes, that not only their Words and Deeds, but all their Imaginations, are evil perpetually in the sight of God, as proceeding from this depraved and wicked Seed: Man therefore as he is in this estate can know nothing aright, yea his Thoughts and Conceptions concerning God and spiritual things, until he be disjoyned from this Evil Seed, and united unto the Divine Light; are unprofitable both to himself and others.* Thus far R. B. pag. (80.)

That which J. N. infers from hence, is groundd upon a mistake of the full sence of the Proposition; which treats of the condition of man in the fall, and as dead, and not as quickened, in any degree to a sence of his condition; The inference is this, That natural Men, or men in their natural and corrupt estate; however they may have the divine Light in them Seminally, or Radically; yet they have not while in that estate any sensation or feeling of it; This is true in R. B's sence of mans natural, and corrupt estate there intended; and explained in the forepart of his Proposition; which he expressly joyns, not only to his being fallen, and degenerated, but dead; which words in J. N's Citation, should have been put in the same differing Character, with the rest of the Proposition; that they might have been distinguished, to have belonged thereto, seeing they bear so great weight; well then, so far R. B. is right, and the quotation proves nothing for J. N's purpose; for surely a dead man (as such) has no sence, nor can have, till he be (in some degree) quickened; we must then distinguish upon this natural, and corrupt estate; which will lead us to this question,

Whe-

(48)

Whether a Man after he be, in and through the day and time of his Visitation, in some measure quickened, through the voice of the Son of God, by which the dead comes to hear, and live; may not still remain in a great measure, in his natural and corrupted estate, subject to the power, nature, and seed of the Serpent; and yet have some sensation, and feeling of the Light, at some times or seasons, during the continuance of the day of his Visitation; I presume there are few, but whose experience will oblige them to confess to the truth of this; I am sure the holy Scripture plainly teaches it; It must then be granted, that this distinction ought to be held, between the different state of man in the fall, viz. as degenerated, & dead, in the first *Adam*; and visited, and quickened by the second *Adam*, of which latter sort, the generality of mankind, either are, or have been; I say have been, because too many after they have been quickened, have died again; and so twice dead, and pluckt up by the Roots, the day of their Visitation being over; for the truth of this I can appeal to my Adversary; hence it will follow that natural men, or men in their natural and corrupt estate, generally speaking, are not without any sensation, or feeling of the divine Light; neither is it rightly inferred from R. B's proposition, for the Reasons I have given, nor from any other thing, that either he or the *Quakers* asserts for Doctrine, that I know of; I am sure both he and they, abundantly evinces the contrary in their Writings; If then natural men, or men in their natural and corrupt estate; visited and quickened to some sense of their condition, may not be said to be altogether without the sensation, and feeling of the Light; By such sensation and feeling of the Divine Light, which at some times and seasons they experience in themselves, they may properly be said to be actually enlightned by it; Though they apply not their minds to hearken diligently to, or to attend and consult it; much less to follow and obey it: Now I hope he will grant his Argument fails, because its foundation in the proposition its self is weak, the consequences depending thereon must sink with it; I might here form a Reverse Argument, but the matter is so plain, that it needs not Sillogisms to demonstrate it; The Result of all is this, that the *Quakers* do not confine the Light within, as to its actual Illumination, to certain men, or to men of a certain order, consequently do not make it a special privilege of their own party; as J. N. hath falsely accused them, neither do they confine it to the Regenerate, from whence he would infer his Charge to be the same; If they confined it to the Regenerate, how should they be converted from their Unregenerate state, seeing all are so by nature, this is preposterous and absurd; On the contrary, they extend it to every one, in the day and time of their visitation; according to the testimony of the holy Scriptures; and where every one is, there is none excluded, *John 1. 9. 3. 19. Tit 2. 11.* &c. R. B. makes use of an excellent quotation to prove this, out of *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*: R. B's Works, pag. 347.

But not content with this, J. N. makes use of another considerable passage out of R. B's *Apoll.* pag. 334, but to as little effect as the former, the Words are these, treating of this divine Light; *We know it to be a Substance, because it subsists in the Hearts of wicked men, even while they are in their Wickedness; Now no accident can be in a subject without it gives the subject its own denomination, as where Whiteness is in a subject, there the subject is called White, so we distinguish betwixt Holiness, as 'tis an accident which denominates man, so as the Seed receives a place in him; and betwixt this holy and substantial Seed, which many times lies in mans Heart, as a naked grain in a stony Ground; so also as we may distinguish betwixt Health, and Medicine; Health cannot be in the Body, without the Body be called healthful, because Health is an accident; but Medicine may be in a Body that is most unhealthful, for that it is a Substance.*

By these words J. N. says, as far as he can judge, R. B. does plainly imply, that wicked men, though they have the Light really and truly in them as well as those that are good; yet they are not actually enlightned by it; If he can imply no better then thus to shut up man in his Darknes; It is no matter how little he does imply. It is indeed, says J. N. in their Hearts, but it lies dormant there like hot embers, covered up under Ashes; without affecting or denominating or enlightning them; To which I Answer,

That the Divine Light, or Seed, may be so at some times, in many, I grant, especially while Man remains in the Sleep of Death, and unsensible; and before he be in some measure quickened and awakned, and after he is quickened and awakened, if he fall asleep and die again: But I affirm that it has not been always so, nor does always remain so in its self; in Man, as passive, or to use J. N's exprellion as dormant there, and like hot embers covered up under Ashes; No, God be infinitely praised for the contrary, for then man must have perished without remedy, being dead, or unable to help, or convert himself to the Light; It is true as R. B. says, Many times it lies in mans Heart, as a naked grain in a stony Ground; But this does not infer that it lies so always; no, God forbid; sometimes it breaks the Stones, and makes way for its entrance, in some degree; otherwise the Soul of man must remain in Death and Darknes, according to the experience of holy *David*, Psal. 119, and 130, *The entrance of thy Word giveth Light, it giveth Understanding to the Simple*: And though R. B. compares it likewise here to Medicine, and in other places to a Physitian, yet not such, as will at no time exert its power; whether the Patient will or no (for indeed in this state the Patient has no will to any thing that is good) so far as to manifest the Physitian hath done his part; But on the contrary the Patient sometimes is awakened out of his Lihurgy, and is made sensible, and forced to confess that the Physitian applied a good and

operative Medicine, which would undoubtedly have wrought and effected the Cure, if the Patient had not been stubborn and untoward.

That this is R. B's sense, is very plain, to be collected out of many places of his *sixth Proposition*, concerning the universal and saving Light of Christ Jesus, particularly *pag. 338. R. B's Works*, where distinguishing between this Light, Seed, &c. and the power and natural faculty of mans mind, which he makes to consist in this, viz. *That a Man in his Health can when he please, stir up, move and exercise the Faculties of his Soul, as being absolute master of them; and except there be some natural Cause or Impediment in the way, he can use them at his pleasure; But this Light or Seed of God, he cannot move or stir up when he pleaseth: But he says, It moves, blows, and strives with men as the Lord seeth meet, &c. And again he says, It comes upon all at certain times and seasons, wherein it works powerfully upon the Soul, mightily tinders it, and breaks it; at which time if Man resist it not, but close with it, he comes to know Salvation by it; even as the Lake of Bethesda, did not cure all those that washed in it, but such only as washed first after the Angel had moved upon the Waters; so God moves in love to mankind in his Seed, in his Heart, at some singular times, setting his Sins in order before him, and seriously inviting him to Repentance; offering to him Remission of Sins, and Salvation, which if man accept of, he may be saved.* R. B. is further positive in these words, following, *'Now there is no man alive, and I am confident there shall be none to whom this Paper shall come, who if they will deal faithfully, and honestly with their own Hearts, will not be forced to acknowledge, but they have been sensible of this in some measure, less or more, which is a thing that man cannot bring upon himself, with all his pains and industry; This then O man and woman is the day of Gods gracious Visitation to thy Soul; which thou shalt be happy forever, if thou resist not; This is the Day of the Lord, which as Christ said, is like the Lightening, that shineth from the East unto the West, and the Wind or Spirit which blows upon the Heart, and no man knows whither it goes, or whence it comes, Matth. 24. 27. John 3. 8.* Again, *pag. 340. R. B's Works*, where R. B. compares *Adam* in his natural corrupt, and fallen condition to divers men lying in a dark Pit together, where all their Sences are so stupified, that they are scarce sensible of their own misery. And then he supposes, that the deliverer comes at certain times, and fully discovers, and informs them of the great misery and hazard they are in, if they continue in that noisome and pestiferous place; yea forces them to a certain sense of their misery; (for the wickedest men at times are made sensible of their misery by God's visitation) and not only so, but lays hold upon them, and gives them a Pull, in order to Lift them out of their Misery; which if they resist not, will save them; only they may resist it. Thus far R. B. Many such Instances I might quote, but that it would be too tedious; I commend them to J. N. to read at his leisure, and consider them more diligently, and uprightly, particularly *pag. 341, 342, 343, 344.* where he proves at large, that God hath given to all Grace sufficient for

for Salvation; and to every Man a day or time of Visitation, wherein 'tis possible for him to be saved; which is expressly contrary to the sence; J. N. would infer from R. B's words, in his citation (viz.) Wicked Men have the Light as to the Act of Possession only; and not as to the Act of Illumination, which considering his Notion of the Act of possession, viz. that it only lies dormant in their Hearts, as hot Embers covered up under Ashes; without effecting or enlightning them, cannot amount unto so much Grace, as is sufficient and necessary to their Salvation; because their cold, dark, stupified, or dead estate, requires the operative exercise of the warming, enlightning, quickening Word of Life, and Light, at some time or other, when it pleaseth the Almighty more powerfully to visit, and influence them; without which it is impossible for them, so much as to see their miserable estate of Wickedness; much less to get out of it; nor so much as to think one good thought; because as the Lord himself witnessed concerning man in the fall, *Gen. 6. 5.* That he saw that every Imagination of the Thoughts of his Heart was only Evil continually: These things being duly considered, I appeal to thy Conscience, sober Reader, whoever thou art, whether both R. B's Words and sence is not manifestly cleared from the mis-implication J. N. hath dis-ingeniously put up them (viz.) that They confine the Act of Illumination to good men only, or to the Regenerate; which is so gross, that it puts me mind of the Lye, that the wicked Jews, to Invalidate the Power of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus, taught the Souldiers to say, viz. That his Disciples stole him away while they slept; which was not only untrue, but morally impossible for them to know what was done while they slept; so it is impossible for men to know the work of Regeneration effected, or to become Regenerate, but through the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus in Spirit; which Implies the Powerful Acts of his divine Illumination previous to that estate; so J. N's charge on the *Quakers*, of confining the Light within, as to the Act of Illumination, to the Regenerate, is not only untrue, in fact; but absurd in inference, not easily to be credited, but rather to be supposed the effect of blindness, or envy.

This does not suffice him, but he goes on in like manner, to abuse and pervert the sence of his Ingenious Author, because he says that the Divine Light, or Seed lies in wicked men, hurt, bruised, wounded, slain, yea and buried; and because he says that in this Seed in the Hearts of all men is the Kingdom of God; as in a capacity to be produced, or rather exhibited; according as it receives depth, is nourished, and not choaked; and again, that this Seed was in the *Pharisees*, as a Seed lying in a barren Ground; which springs not forth because it wants Nourishment.

From all which J. N. infers what is not at all to be infered, viz. That the *Quakers* do exclude all wicked men from the Actual *P's.* (83.)

Illumination of the Divine Light ; but how does he prove it ? does he think it is enough to say so, & make quotations (instead of proofs) that has not the least tendency to favour his assertion ; is J. N. so fondly conceited of his Character with many of the Learned world ; that he can impose upon their credit, at this rate (*Ipse Dixit*) I hope as they know they have two Ears, they will conclude it wisdom to use them ; if J. N. produce no better arguments than he has done, to make the *Quakers* to confine the Divine Light to good men, or to the Regenerate, as to the act of Illumination ; and if he proves no better that they make it a special privilege of their own party, and make none but those of their own way to be actually enlightened by it, then hitherto he has done ; he must excuse me, if I still lay it as a false Charge at his door : There needs no further answer to this quotation, only let it be observed, that though this divine Light, or Seed, is in a true sence, said to be hurt, bruised, wounded, yea slain, and buried in the hearts of wicked men, according to their degrees of Wickedness ; as with respect to its Life in man ; as may be instanced out of the holy Scriptures concerning Christ, both before and since he took upon him our Flesh ; as may be read at large in the 53d. of *Isaiah*, verse 4, 5. *Surely he hath born our Griefs, and carried our Sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted ; but he was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our Iniquities ; the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, &c.* And vers. 7. *He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, &c.* And vers. 9. *And he made his Grave with the Wicked ; and with the Rich in his Death, &c.* *Amos* 2. 13. *Behold I am pressed under you as a Cart is pressed that is full of Sheaves.* *Heb.* 6. 6. *They crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame.* Thus Christ our divine Light, in his great condescension, with respect to that degree of his Life as in the hearts of wicked men, is, and hath been throughout all Ages, oppressed, grieved, wounded, crucified and buried, though in his own intire fulness he neither did, nor could suffer ; But has a Life with God the Father, that cannot be hurt nor bruised, &c. by the Power of which Life, he not only quickens, heals and raises up his own Seed and Birth in men, when he seeth meet, but in and thereby renews his Call and heavenly Invitations to corrupt and wicked men, during the day of their Visitation, thereby illuminating, and instructing them ; And when they wound and oppress him, by multiplying their Sins and Iniquities ; He causes his mournings, and complaints sometimes to enter their hard hearts, to cause them to mourn over him whom they have pierced, that by his Stripes they might be healed ; That this Seed of the Kingdom of God, is in the hearts of all men is certain, that it was in the very *Pharisees* who opposed and resisted Christ, is true, *Luke* 17. 20, 21. That it is in a capacity to be produced, or rather exhibited ; and that according as it receives depth, is nourished, and not choked, as R. B. says is all true, and makes nothing for his purpose.

But how is this Seed in a Capacity to be produced or exhibited, surely not without its powerful operation at some time or other; as R. B. says in the former quotation; consequently not according to J. N's fence or inference, of its being in the Hearts of the wicked in possibility only; or as hot Embers covered up under Ashes, without affecting, denominating or enlightning them; and this he concludes the *Quakers* make to be all the dispensation of the Light to the Wicked; seeing he says they confine it as to its act of Illumination to the Regenerate, which I hope I have fully answered.

J. N. says, *Every body knows that has had the least Conversation, either with the Quakers, or with their Writings, They do confine the Light as to the Act of Illumination (only) to those that turn their Soul and Mind Inward unto it, till then as the Prefacer to Mr. B's Works says Man is darkness.* I answer, this is a great mistake and presumption, to say that every body knows what no body can; because it is not true in fact; What though man be darkness, as the Apostle said, *Ephes. 5. 8. Ye were sometime Darkness, but now are ye Light in the Lord, walk as Children of the Light*; does not the Light shine in Darkness, and the Darkness comprehended it not, *John 1. 5.* This perhaps he will grant; but is it not also said, *2 Cor. 4. 6, 7. God who commanded Light to shine out of Darkness, hath shined in our Hearts, to give us the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ: But we have this treasure in our earthen Vessels, that the Excellency of the Power may be of God, and not of us.* Here we may see that the Divine Light, does not always remain as hot Embers covered up under Ashes; but shines both in Darkness, and out of Darkness to give the Light of the Knowledge, &c.

J. N. argues from the repeated Admonitions and Exhortations of the *Quakers*, viz. - That they would turn their Souls inward unto the Light, that they would mind, heed, follow it, and wait upon it, in quietness and silence; all which he says would be extremely ridiculous, and impertinent, if either men might be enlightned, without converting themselves to the Light, or if it were certain and necessary, that all men should so convert themselves to it. One might wonder that a man of his Learning should reason so ignorantly; but that God hath hid these things from the Wise and Prudent, and revealed them unto Babes, as appeared in the instance of *Nicodemus*, a Ruler in *Israel*, how ignorant was he of the new Birth. I answer it is necessary, and men must be first enlightned in some degree, in order to turn their Souls inward unto the Light; for how should man that is dark, and dead to God, turn his mind to that which he hath no feeling, fence, or sight of; nor can have, but as the Light opens it in him and to him; *Psal. 36. 9. With thee (said holy David) is the Fountain of Life, in thy Light shall we see Light.* Well then, tho' men may be, are, and must be, enlightned in some measure, before they

can convert themselves to the Light; yet it is so far from being extreamly Ridiculous, that it is absolutely Necessary they should convert themselves to it, and believe in it, that they may become the Children of it, and witness the encrease of it unto the Salvation of their Souls; *The Path of the Just is as a shining Light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect Day,* Prov. 4. 18. Though much more might be said, yet I think this Answer is sufficient to make void his Inference, and shew that the *Quakers* do not confine the Light within as to any act of its Illumination, to those that convert or introvert themselves to it.

But J. N. apprehending he had not done enough, as though it were not sufficient to have misapplied and perverted the *Quakers* Doctrine, with their wholsom and Christian Admonitions, and Exhortations, to fault their Principle of the Divine Light; He sets himself to abuse and traduce them about the Character of their Profession.

pag. (84.) *It is well known, says he, they look upon themselves, to be the only Professors, and embracers of the Truth of God, the (only) followers of the Light, and the (only) Converters of themselves to it; which it seems is so much the proper Characteristick of a Quaker; that when any one is proselited to their Way, 'tis ordinary for them to say, such a one is turned to the Light; whence, he says, he thinks he had very good reason to say that they confined the Light to their own party.*

To which I say, if Lying Stories, and False Insinuations be good Reason, he has it, and not otherwise; For it is an extravagant Charge and spiteful reflection at Rovers; and doubtless if not invented, is taken upon trust, so far as it may affect any particulars, under the Profession of *Quakers*; and either way as generally applied is an abuse; for as it is general, it is most certainly false, and Injurious, and bespeaks him to be at a loss, and driven to a pinch, to use his Wits; or as we use to say, when men are linking to catch at any thing; but is he so weak, as to think this will make for his purpose; It induces me with some others to believe, that his companions Reproaches, hath made him ashamed of what he first said in favour of the *Quakers* Principle; which joyned with the fear of loss of preferment; might not only extort this pittingful shuffle he has made, but spur him on thus Injuriously to treat the *Quakers*; He must find better arguments, & produce better proofs, to convince sober and Religious men; that the *Quakers* confine the Divine Light to their own party, as to the Regenerate; however he thinks his News may prevail upon the credulity of his Learned world;

pag. 85. I take notice, he says, *He does not find, nor does not see, how the Quakers can upon their Principle extend the Divine Light, as to the Act of Illumination, as a common benefit to all men, without exception.* If he be as blind as Nicodemus, who can help it; but I think he is worse, for instead of being willing to see aright; he labours to see wrong, and so is the more blind;

blind; and if the blind lead the blind, they both fall into the Ditch; and this is manifest from the Reason he hath given, why he does not see as above, *viz.* because, as he says, the *Quakers* make it, *viz.* the Divine Light, the Grace of Christ, whereas for that it is so; and for the same Reason, the *Quakers* make it both necessary, and universal, according to the holy Scriptures, *Rom. 5. 15. 18. Tit. 2. 11. The Grace of God which bringeth Salvation hath appeared unto all men, &c.* But has J. N. forgotten, that he makes his *Light to be Grace too in some degrees* pag. 46.

of it; and the greatest Grace of God too, with respect to the degrees of it; which are his own words; what does the *Quakers* by making their divine Light, to be the Grace of Christ, destroy the universality of its actual Illumination, and so confine it; and does J. N. making it to be the greatest Grace of God, with respect to its degrees, extend, and enlarge it; what is not Christ the greatest Grace of God? and is it not manifest the *Quakers* believe him so; or is J. N.'s notion of the Light more universal, and extensive in those degrees, he apprehends it is not Grace; then in those degrees he apprehends it is Grace; what confused, and incoherent Notions, does this man bring forth; if his Light be Grace, it is Christ; if not Christ, it is not Grace; but if Christ, he is universal; all things are in, and by him; and he in and through all things; and what can he make more of his Light? But perhaps he would be a Novist, and set up for a new speculative Notion to tickle and please the fancy of such of his Learned World, whose Religion stands in the Conceptions and Imaginations of their own Brain; and not in the Divine sense of Gods pure heavenly Life, Light, and Power in their own Souls; to purify, and renew them, and make them fit Temples for his holy Spirit to dwell in.

In the foregoing Charge, J. N. hath not offered at any proof; for doubtless he knew of none; and therefore delivered it upon presumption; the matter must be referred then to Doctrine, for a determination of the Truth or falshood of this general Charge upon the *Quakers*.

The question then will be, whether the *Quakers*, because they profess Salvation by Christ Jesus, under the denomination of the Light; as it was prophesied concerning him, that he should be given a Light unto the *Gentiles*; and God's Salvation to the ends of the Earth, *Isa. 49. 6.* That this Light is come, and hath appeared, and manifested its self in the hearts of all men; and is the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the World, *John 1. 9.* To give Light to them that sit in Darkness, and in the shadow of Death, to guide our Feet in the Way of Peace; *Luke 1. 79.* according to the holy Scriptures, by which the *Quakers* have been, and are distinguished from the professed *Christians* of other Societies; though they have not, nor do not confine, or limit their holy Profession, to that denomination only; but extend it as far as all the divine attributes

tributes that is given him, viz. Christ the Light by the holy Ghost.

Whether this Doctrine of the *Quakers*, infers a necessity for them to believe and say, as J. N. charges them; or whether they do, or have have at any time in their publick exercise of Preaching, or Writing, or otherwise generally speaking, taught, exhibited or declared; that therefore or because of such their distinct Profession; or for any other cause, they are the (only) professors and embracers of the Truth of God; and the (only) followers of the Light, and the (only) converters of themselves to it; which are the words of J. N's charge; as likewise when any one is profelited to the *Quakers* way, that 'tis ordinary for them to say, such a one is turned to the Light; from whence he says, he thinks he had very good reason to say, that the *Quakers* confined the Light to their own party, as to the Act of Illumination; Note by the way, the *Quakers* understand better, it is one thing to profess the Light, and it is another thing to turn to it; Until this Charge be proved, on which this undue consequence is grounded, which I am well satisfied never can, because I am well assured it is inconsistent with the Christian Principle, and Charity of the *Quakers* so to believe, and say, whatever J. N's pretensions are to good Reason; I must return it back upon him, as a notorious Slander of their Christian Profession; he might as well and truly have said in plain terms, that the *Quakers* allows none to profess Salvation, nor to obtain Salvation, by Christ Jesus, but themselves, because he alone is the Truth of God, and the Divine Light; and if none but the *Quakers* profess and embrace him, viz. the Truth of God, follow the Light, and convert themselves to it; It inevitably follows, from the words of his Charge, That the *Quakers* look upon themselves, as the only People which can or shall be saved: Behold the fruits and effects of J. N's Charity, the want of which as he apprehends in me, is the stress of his complaint and ground of that Ignominious character he bestows upon me (viz.) for censuring him, from matter of Scandalous fact, he had published against the *Quakers*; for which together with this gross Addition, the Lord rebuke him, and make him sensible of his Wickedness, and grant him true Repentance: And now seeing he hath made so many quotations out of R. B's *Apoll.* to an ill use and purpose; misapplying and perverting his sense, contrary to his manifest and declared Judgment, plainly and positively, exprest in the said Book; I think fit to give him one instance out of it, in opposition to his Charge, and in vindication of the *Quakers* Profession and Charity.

Where R. B. pag. 357, 358, 359. treating of the universal and saving Light of Christ, upon that Text of *Rom. 5. 18. Therefore as by the Offence of one Judgement came upon all men to Condemnation, so by the Righteousness of one the free Gift came upon all men to the Justification of Life*; having before shewed how that Christ dyed for all men; here he shews that as all have received

a loss from *Adam*, which leads to Condemnation ; so all have received a Gift from *Christ*, which leads to Justification, and consequently that all are enlightned by *Christ*, and have a measure of saving Light and Grace, by the operation of which some have been, and may yet be saved, to whom the Gospel is not outwardly preached, nor the History of *Christ* outwardly known ; but by its being preached in every Creature ; Many are comprehended that have not the outward knowledge ; therefore of those many some may be saved ; to prove that all men have a measure of saving Grace, he quotes that excellent saying of the Apostle *Paul* to *Titus*, cap. 2. 11. *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation hath appeared unto all men*, &c. joyned with *Rom. 5. 18*. From which he shews it naturally follows that all men, even the *Heathens* may be saved, for *Christ* was given a Light to enlighten the *Gentiles* ; and so he comes to answer the great Objection, viz. That there is no Name under Heaven by which Salvation is known, but by the Name of *Jesus* ; and further says, Though they know it not outwardly, yet if they know it inwardly by feeling the vertue and power of it, to free them from Sin and Iniquity in their Hearts, they are saved by it ; He confesses there is no other Name given to be saved by ; but Salvation lyeth not in the literal, but experimental knowledge ; albeit those that have the literal knowledge are not saved by it ; without this real and experimental knowledge ; yet those that have the real knowledge, may be saved without the external ; and so he goes on and enforces his Argument, considers the state of Infants, and deaf People, and compares the state of the latter to *Chinches*, or *Indians*, respecting the like Charity to be had towards such, who though they can hear, are under a simple impossibility of hearing the Gospel outwardly preached, &c. and then takes notice of that remarkable passage or saying of *Peter*, *Acts 10. 34. Of a Truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons, but in every Nation he that feareth him, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted of him*. And then observes that *Peter* was before liable to that mistake, that the rest of the *Jews* were, in judging that all were unclean except themselves ; and that no man could be saved, except he were proselited to their Religion, and circumcised ; but God shewed *Peter* otherwise in a Vision, and taught him to call nothing Common or Unclean ; and therefore seeing that God regarded the Prayers of *Cornelius*, who was a stranger to the Law, and to *Jesus Christ* as to the outward ; yet *Peter* saw that God had accepted him, and he is said to fear God, before he had this outward knowledge ; Therefore *Peter* concludes that every one that in every Nation, without respect of Persons, feareth God and worketh Righteousness, is accepted of him ; so he makes the fear of God, and the working of Righteousness, and not an outward historical knowledge, the qualification : they then that have this, where ever they be, are saved ; I have done with the quotation, the design of it is obvious, and its application plain ; God who instructed *Peter*, and brought him into a right perswasion, and sence

of the substance its self, hath illuminated and instructed his People called *Quakers*; in this Age, to think and speak of things as they are; and not to Judge by outward appearance, but to judge righteous Judgment; and to give to God the honour and glory of his own Work, in and through the Hearts of all; in what manner, kind or degree soever, he is pleased to appear to magnifie his Power, and shew forth his Praise, in the Salvation of men: And now as bad explicators of the Light as J. N. esteems the *Quakers*, I recommend him to persuade his own People to be good Followers of it, as they are; wherein he will find himself better employed, then thus to fall foul of them, soon after their Sufferings.

By what is already said, I think it is sufficiently evinced, that it is a down right fallacy to say, the *Quakers* confine the Light within, and make it a special privilege of a certain order of men, their own party, as to the act of Illumination; having made the contrary appear not only by confuting J. N.'s misapplications out of R. B.'s *Apology*; but by producing out of the same possitive proof, that all are actually enlightened at one time or other, during the day of their Visitation, consequently that the *Quakers* are not therein guilty of contradictions, and inconsistent with themselves, as he would needs render them, the better to set off and expose his Notion of the Light, as more refined and Novel, by lessening the Repute and credit of theirs, which the Righteous God beholds.

J. N. Replies to my dislike of his distinction, of a possibility and not actually, with respect to the divine Illumination of this pag. 86.
Principle of the Light, and queries, *May there not be a Capacity of being enlightened, where there is no actual Illumination.* I answer No. Again he queries, *Are not these distinct Ideas, and may not therefore one be without the other.* I answer no; for although man in the Fall, and in his degenerate nature, is considered as blind, and dead to God; and consequently void of any distinct good habit or capacity as of himself; but by the actual Illumination of the Word of Life, and Light; he comes to have his Spiritual Eyes opened, and to be quickened; so as in some small measure at least, to have his spiritual sense restored, in which Word the capacity is given (for which end the divine Word actually enlightens every man coming into the World) and by the operation of that power, the beginning of the New Creation, is known in man that believes in the Light; consequently that cannot be said to be a distinct Idea in man, before it is in being, or created; which made me say, that the possibility, or capacity is not, nor can be in man, abstract (or divided) from the Actual illuminating Power and Spirit, no more then Seeing, if Light be sepearte from the Eye.

Why then, says J. N. *do they so often divide the one from the other, in making all to be capable of Illumination by the Divine Light,* pag. (86.)
when yet according to them, all are not actually enlightened by it; nor any at all times.
I answer, this were a contradiction indeed, whoever were guilty of it; but

I am sure the *Quakers* are not; but J. N. says of the former, viz. *That all are not actually enlightned by it, I have already given an account out of Mr. B.* This former the *Quakers* deny, having ever constantly maintained the contrary; viz. That all are or have been actually enlightned by it, in some degree or measure, during the day of their Visitation; and I have proved the same to be their Principle at large, out of R. B's *Apoll.* and shewed J. N's perversion, as to the latter, That none are actually enlightned by it at all times; he says the same Author is so kind to furnish him with an account in another place, where he gives this as a reason why the Light is no Power, or natural faculty of mans mind, because he cannot be actually enlightned by it at pleasure, but must wait for the Irradations of it; for says R. B. This Light, Seed, &c. appears to beno Power or Natural Faculty of mans Mind, because a man that is in Health, can when he pleases, stir up, move, and exercise the faculties of his Soul, he is absolute master of them; but the Light and Seed of God in man he cannot move or stir up, when he pleases; but it moves, blows and strives with man as the Lord seeth meet; for though there be a possibility of Salvation to every man, during the Day of his Visitation; yet cannot a man at any time when he pleaseth, or hath some sence of his misery, stir up that Light and Grace, so as to procure to himself tenderness of Heart; but he must wait for it; which comes upon him at certain times and seasons, wherein it works powerfully upon the Soul, mightily tenders it and breaks it, at which time if Man resist it not, but close with it, he comes to know Salvation by it. pag. (87.)

Here I observe that J. N. left out the latter part of this quotation, which made expressly against his 1st Position, viz. that according to the *Quakers* all are not actually enlightned; wherefore though I made use of it before, not considering this renew'd occasion, I thought fit to insert that part of it again, that it might be seen how unsincerely and designedly ill J. N. hath managed himself towards his ingenious Author, and therein towards the *Quakers*; making him and them by mis-implication and consequence, to contradict themselves, and invalidate a Doctrine so essentially necessary to the Salvation of men, and so constantly and positively asserted by them.

But now as to J. N's latter Position (viz.) that none are actually enlightned by it at all times, to which end he makes his last quotation, which though it proves not what he says, and is off from the point in question; viz. that all are actually enlightned by it at some times; I have considered this matter, and apprehend it may be resolv'd into this distinction, viz. The different estates or attainments of such as are illuminated, and converted, some whereof may arrive to such a degree of habitual union, and inhabitation in the Light as to go no more forth, but continue and abide in their heavenly capacity, the divine Influence, secretly and hiddenly at-

tending their Souls, in the necessary concerns of this Life, as in eating, drinking, plowing, sowing, or the like, these cannot be said at any time not to be actually enlightened, because of their spiritual habit; though they may be, and are oft-times without the renewed operations and fresh visitations of this divine Light, and Seed of God, upon their Souls; which man cannot move, nor stir up when he please; but it moves, blows and strives with man as the Lord seeth meet, and man must wait for it; This is true, as applied to a state of weakness, and sence of misery, as well as growth, in the first; of which states R. B. doth here make use of it, bringing in the comparison of the Lake of *Bethesda*, and the Angel at certain times moving upon the Waters; whence J. N. infers this conclusion (viz.) because R. B. says, that man though he hath some sence of his misery, cannot when he please stir up that Light and Grace by which he must be saved; but must wait for it, therefore no man, though never so close a follower of the Light, is under the Illumination of it at all times; I think this Inference is very wide, and far from a direct and natural consequence of R. B's words and sence, because by the Instance he makes use of, viz. a Man that hath some sence of his misery, He implies some previous degree of actual Illumination in that subject, by which he attained to that sence, and much more is it implied in a state of waiting; for how is it possible for any man to attain to a sence of his misery, that was dead in Sins and Trespasses, much more to a condition of waiting for deliverance, without he should first be quickened; and be made to experience some degree of the actual Illumination of the Divine Light; by which it is manifest, that R. B. here was not treating of a subject, altogether destitute of actual Illumination; consequently that Light and Grace, which he says, man cannot stir up when he pleases, but must wait for, by which he must be saved; He intends not barely that degree of actual Illumination, which was and is necessary to give man a sight and sence of his misery; but an increase thereof by a fresh visitation of the Divine Light, Seed and Grace, whereby his Heart may be tendered and deliverance witnessed.

But J. N. still queries, *Why may not the capacity of Illumination be abstracted from the act, since they are not only in themselves distinct, but proceed from different Causes, and between which there is according to them no necessary connexion.* Answer,

Because man cannot have the capacity, but in and by the Act, which Act is as the Light to the Eye, & the capacity as the Eye to the Light; how should a dark man see the Sun? unless the Sun by the powerful act of its light, first procure him sight? what capacity of seeing has a blind man; surely none; can that then be properly said to be distinct, which is not in being? And how can that be said to proceed from different Causes, where the cause is but one, and the other but an effect, when created? But why does J. N. say,

say, That according to the Quakers, there is not a necessary connexion between the capacity of Illumination, and the Act; seeing I make it as necessary as Light to the Eye in order to seeing; where I say that the Capacity or possibility is not, nor can be in man, abstract or divided from the actual illuminating Power and Spirit, no more then seeing if Light be seperate from the Eye: But J. N. alters my sence by adding to my words, both in my Exception, and his Answer by adding the word (Nor) So that he makes me to say if the Light be not seperate from the Eye, and thence it is I suppose, he concludes expressly contrary to my assertion, viz. that according to the Quakers there is no necessary connexion, which is unfair and unjust: But J. N. apprehending no necessary connexion, makes the former, viz. The capacity of Illumination, to depend upon the inbeing (only) of the divine Light; and the latter (viz.) the Act upon the Souls introversion of its self to it, without which she will not be enlightned by that Light which she bears; which are his exprefs words; To which I Reply, first, to his making the capacity to depend upon the inbeing only, &c. That as it is opposed to Act, it is exclusive of the operation of the Light, suitable to the subject and end; Christ who is this divine Light is so, viz. operative in all things; and shall he not be so in man; God forbid; what Doctrine is this? that excludes lost man from the means of Salvation; will not the Vision of the Prophet Ezekiel, concerning the dry Bones in the open Valley confute him? Ezek. 37. 5. Thus saith the Lord God unto these dry Bones, behold I will cause Breath to enter into you, and ye shall live. Was it not impossible for these dry Bones to have come together; but by the operation of the Word of the Lord; or how could these dry have lived; if God had not caused Breath to have entered into them.

As to the latter, viz. That the Act of Illumination depends upon the Soul's introversion of its self, &c. This is to make the Act of Seeing to prevent the Light by which it does and only can see, and the Act of Motion previous to the Act of Life; for the Act of Illumination is considered, as causing Breath to enter into the Soul, and introversion the Souls motion; as an effect of some degree of Life, in order to obtain more Life: The contrary to this is to make void the end, and divide the Light from its Act of shining, which cannot be; how can the inbeing (only) of the Divine Light in this sence, reach to the Soul, without the Act of its Illumination; and how can the Soul before she experiences this, be in any measure enlightned; and if she be not in some measure enlightned, how should she attain to the capacity of introverting her self to the Divine Light? what I have here said shall suffice for an Answer to his two following Pages, wherein he pursues his Argument upon his former mistaken Consequence, and then descends into a Physical discourse of the Act of Seeing, with which I think not my self concerned further; then as having made use of it as a Similitude.

33
The next thing J. N. takes notice of is the Contradiction I assign upon him which I have done in the following Words, that thou mayst not want occasion to traduce the Quakers, thou hast so much overdone it in this Section, as to contradict thy self in the 5th, as for instance,

Post. Sect. 4. To be actually enlightened, according to thy Principle, is no special privilege, but the common and universal benefit of all men, yea of all the intelligent Creation; who all see and understand in this Light; without which there would be neither Truth nor Understanding.

Post. Sect. (5.) On the contrary, thou sayst, Thy Light does not formally enlighten or instruct thee, but when thou attends to and consults it, and read what was written in those divine Ideal Characters. See what contradictions thy strained Notions runs thee into; one while to be actually enlightned is the common and universal benefit of all men; another while only of those who consult it and attend to it.

Upon this J. N. tells me, I have so lately spoiled my Credit with him, in this point, that he shall not be very forward to take my Word for a Contradiction again. A pretty turn off, if it would do, but suspecting it; he hath used a great deal of artifice to cover, & hide this Contradiction; and all to no purpose, so long as the two old pieces remain, it will be seen where the Crack was; and there is no way to prevent that, but by new moulding the Lump; but that is too much Self-denial I doubt for my Adversary to comply with; for then he shall be taken *pro confesso*; wherefore we must examine it a little further, That it is a contradiction in *Termini*, I think no body that has common sense will deny; And that it may appear to be no mistake of his sense; And to shew that his urging the consideration, and colating together the two different occasions, upon which these two seemingly opposite passages as he terms them, were delivered, is only to trifle and shuffle with his Reader; I shall make use of one or two quotations more out of his *Reflect. &c.* pag. 71. Sect. 5th and 6th, where he says, The Divine Logos enlightens in a double respect, either Fundamentally, or Potentially, by putting us into a capacity of Illumination, by his intimate union and presence with us, or else effectually or actually when we attend to this Divine Light, which is always present to us, though we are not so to it; in the former sense he enlightens every man; in the latter only those who duly consult him, and attend to him. Again, Sect. 6. That the Divine Logos is an enlightener in the same proportion; He is a Redeemer, How is it that, he tells us; he Redeems us either by putting us in a salvable, or Reconcilable state, which is a Redemption universal, or In-conditionate, and antecedent; or by actually reconciling or saving us; which depends upon and is consequent to certain conditions; and is conferred only upon those who are qualified accordingly.

By these two last quotations it is very manifest, that J. N's Doctrine teaches that none are effectually, and actually enlightned, but such who qualify themselves

themselves by *actually* consulting the Light, no more than they *are* *effectually*
 and *actually* Redeemed, without performing the conditions annexed,
 by which they are *actually* reconciled and saved; (where by the way it is
 to be noted, *effectually* and *actually* is to be understood in the same formal
 sense as *fundamentally* and *potentially* are, viz. *ex parte objecti*;) This is
 plain, and must be granted to be J. N.'s sense, without relation to the oc-
 casion of his Postscript, or opposition to the *Quakers* belief of the Light
 within; which for ought I know has been the very cause of his confusion,
 and contradiction of himself, so extremely as he has about it; in the first
 of those two quotations he says, The Divine Light is always present to us,
 though we are not so to it, and yet makes this presence to be an inbeing
 (only) exclusive of actual Illumination, which inbeing according to him
 is like hot Embers covered under Ashes without affecting the subject, and
 so all may be said to be present to the divine Light; for in him we live,
 move, and have our being: And though he pretends an evasion from the
 Contradiction assigned between his 4th and 5th Articles; and Propositions with
 respect to the different occasion. I answer, no difference in the occasion
 can or ought to oblige to a contradiction of his own Thesis, or Principle;
 unless by means of a defect in itself, and then it is better honestly to con-
 fess and mend it, than seek to hide and cover it; here he may very
 well resume the plea to himself, which he made for the *Quakers*; that is, to
 be always so strictly attentive of the Consequence of what one lays down,
 as never to say any thing inconsistent with ones Principle, is a happiness
 that men of more Logical Heads than the *Quakers* are generally presumed
 to be, would give a great deal to be sure of: He has verified this saying in
 himself, and I am willing he should have the advantage of his plea; only
 'tis fit he should know the want of it, otherwise will do him little good:
 Will his pretention of occasion for opposing his Notion, to what he had
 formed to be the *Quakers*, as to the confinement of the Light to certain
 men, justify his assertion in his 4th Article, that to be actually enlightened
 is no special privilege, but the common and universal benefit of all men,
 yea of all the intelligent Creation; and at the same time in his 5th Article,
 having the like occasion to oppose himself against another pretended No-
 tion of the *Quakers*; making the Light to be some determinated formed
 dictate, or proposition, &c. will it I say justify him in a direct contra-
 dictory assertion, viz. That his Light does not formally enlighten him,
 but when he attends to it and consults it, and read what is written in those
 divine Ideal Characters. This is a sort of Legerdmain in arguing or
 writing; I think most unallowable; but in which sense shall we take his
 Notion; I conclude it must be in the latter, from the two collateral quo-
 tations which are very positively express; well then I must thence wishal
 conclude, J. N. hath not only wronged, and misrepresented the *Quakers*,

as to the confinement of the Light to certain men; but hath faulted himself and his own Notion, through the Inconsistency of his Assertions; for he hath not only unduly blamed the *Quakers*, but hath improved it so far, as to form an argument upon it, *pag.* 78. for confining the Light, as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate, according as he represents them; whereas it is not the *Quakers* Doctrine, but his own he militates against, which I undertake to manifest, by reversing his own Argument upon him, by a double Proposition on his own Words.

He that says the Divine Light, doth effectually and actually enlighten those (only) who duly consult and attend to it, excludes all others from being effectually, or actually enlightned, or instructed by it.

He that excludes all those from being formally, effectually or actually enlightned, or instructed by the Divine Light; who does not duly attend to it and consult it, does confine the Divine Light, as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate. — But J. N. does so exclude all those from being formally, effectually and actually enlightned or instructed by the Divine Light, who does not duly consult to it, and attend to it.

Therefore J. N. does confine the divine Light as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate.

He that makes the Divine Light to be an enlightner in the same proportion, he is a Redeemer, and this proportion to be either Potential, Universal or Inconditionate, or effectual and actual, as depending upon certain Conditions and Qualifications: And he that excludes all who have not these certain Conditions and Qualifications, from being effectually and actually enlightned, and redeemed, confines the Light as to the Act of its Illumination, and Redemption, to the persons so qualified which are the Reconciled and Regenerate.

But J. N. does so make the Divine Light, to be an enlightner in the same proportion as he is a Redeemer, &c. And he does exclude all who have not these certain Conditions, and Qualifications, &c. from being effectually and actually enlightned, and Redeemed.

Therefore J. N. does confine the Divine Light as to the Act of Illumination, to the Regenerate.

Here he hath given me occasion again to say, he had better have let the *Quakers* Principles alone, till he had considered it and his own better, and accordingly represented them: But he has another Turn for it, and what is it? why thus, in his own words, *When I say it enlightens men only* *pag.* 91.

when they attend to it, and consult it; I do not suppose that there are any that are not actually enlightned; but that those who are enlightned, are enlightned by attending; supposing at the same time that all men do in some measure attend to, and consult the Divine Light, so far at least as is necessary to their common and ordinary way of understanding; and to render them Rational and Intelligent Beings.

Here

Here he is off the Hinges, and makes his Light as to the Act of its universal Illumination, to be that which distinguisheth us from other Animals; by which we know the whole is more then the part, and the like, and consequently as such is not properly termed Grace, for certainly as himself confesses, *a Man may understand without Grace*: But by his leave I must tell him, this is still a pittiful & dis-ingenious shuffling, for pag. (47.) his Assertions in three several places are positively exclusive of actual Illumination to all, but such as consult it and attend to it: Now if notwithstanding this Restriction, and Limitation, he supplies there are none but what do consult it and attend to it, his Limitation is frivolous, and impertinent; And if he says one thing, and supposes another, and should continue in this practice; whatever his learned world thinks of him, in time it will not be much regarded what he either says or supposes; I am sure he has declared, that the Divine Light is an enlightner, in the same proportion he is a Redeemer; and that he makes to be a Reconciled and saved estate, dependig upon and consequent to certain Conditions and Qualifications; and in that respect makes actual Illumination to be parrallel with it; and not otherwise: Now he may with as much Reason and truth, suppose and assert, that all are actually Redeemed, because they can read, profess and talk of it, as he may, that all are actually enlightened by the Divine Light, because they have the exercise of their Rational faculty. But to examine the matter a little farther, Let his 5th Proposition be considered, and we shall find it stated in his own Person; viz. *My Light does not formally enlighten or instruct me; but when I attend to it and consult it, and read what is written in those divine Ideal Characters.* Would J. N. have us understand him, that this enlightning and instructing, which require his attention and consulting, &c. had relation to his rational faculty, to render him a rational and intelligent Being; surely he did not intend so then, for this double Reason, viz. that before he did consult and attend to the Light, it would follow he could not be a Rational and intelligent Being; and should cease to continue so any longer then while he continued his attention and consulting; which is to make his actual Illumination, and consequently the means by which it is procured, equally necessary at all times; well then, why must we understand his actual Illumination of all in this sence now; since the same consequence will lye but to serve a turn: But take it either way, it brings him under a Delemma; for if his Light, and its Act of Illumination, be universally extensive only in a degree necessary to render men rational, and intelligent Beings; supposing in that degree all consult it; Then in that degree it is not Grace: But if he makes his Light to be Grace, and the Act of its Illumination universally extensive (only) to such as attend to it and consult it, and then supposes all do in some measure attend to it and consult it; and that consequently all are enlight-

ned. He places the stress of his Consequence, upon a Presumption and Supposition unallowable, because untrue; for all do not attend to and consult the divine Light, as so considered; but most Resist it, and Rebel against the Light, who knows not the Paths thereof: Thus J. N's Supposition failing, his Consequence sinks with it; and his Proposition in the former quotations being divested, and cleared from these Evasions on either hand, they remain as they were; and do and will inevitably imply a confinement of the Divine Light, as to the Act of Illumination, to such as attend to it and consult it, which excludes the wicked, and must be understood to be the good, or Regenerate; consequently what he would fasten on the *Quakers*, lites on himself; and the contradiction I assigned upon him is made good.

Thus upon the whole matter whilst I grant he makes his Light to be no special privilege, but the common and universal benefit of all men, yea of all the intelligent Creation, according to his 4th Article; I plain-
 pag. 23. ly shew he makes this universal benefit to be, in his own words, a mans Natural and Ordinary way of understanding; and what is that, but the exercise of the Rational Faculty of his Soul; or in a word his Natural Reason; so that in the conclusion it amounts to no more then as is before observed, viz. That according to him, it is universal as to the Act of its Illumination in this sence only, viz. of Reason, and not Grace; whence it is he supposes all men do in some measure, attend to and consult the Divine Light, as necessary to render them rational and intelligent Beings; as though Men ceased to be any longer Rational and Intelligent Beings, then whilst they consulted and attended the Divine Light, which I deny; for then *Adam* with all his Posterity in the fall, would have ceased to be Men; seeing nothing differs Man in that state from the Beast, but his rational property; and it cannot be supposed, that when *Adam* had consulted with the Serpent's Spirit that had entred *Eve*, and was subdued by it, under Sin and Transgression; and so dyed, as to his Spiritual Life, that notwithstanding while in that estate; He did or could consult with, and attend to the Divine Light, with respect to his Rational Life; but the contrary, viz. That he was therein also enslaved, and captivated by the Serpent's power and wisdom.

Thus J. N. supposes what is not at all to be supposed, viz. that all men does in some measure attend to and consult the divine Light, would to God they did; but it is most certain they do not, witness'd by the Apostle *Paul*, *Rom.* 3. 10, 11, 12. describing the condition of Man in the Fall, *There is none Righteous no not one; There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God; They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable, there is none that doth good, no not one.* Surely then it must be confessed, that in this state none does attend to and consult the divine
 Light;

Light: The Imagination of the thoughts of mans heart being only Evil and that continually.

I think now we are at the bottom of J. N's Notion of the Light, being a mans Natural and Ordinary way of understanding; and see what it amounts to, and that he might not be understood by his *5th Article*, to deny or contradict what he asserted in his *4th*, viz. That all are actually enlightened. He is content to have his Light understood in a restricted sence, viz. not as an extraordinary accession to the Natural Light, *pag.* (60.) but Natural Light, or that by which man is rendred a Rational and Intelligent Being; not as saving Grace, in the whole kind of it, *pag.* (91.) but as an ordinary requisite to human understanding, that is to qualifie Man to be a reasonable Creature: This is a just and true account of his sence and expressions, let it go as far as it will; But if this be all he intends by his Light; It is manifest, that whilst he professes it to be the Divine Logos; He debases and not exalts it; for as so it is, Christ Jesus, who is full of Grace and full of Truth; otherwise I see no reason to call it Grace at all; for Grace is distinguished from Nature; and the understanding men have by nature, meaning human nature, is not the same they have by Grace; for a man may have the one, and not the other.

In the conclusion J. N. says, *So long as I make all men in pag.* (91.) *some measure to consult it, though I do wishal say that they are enlightened by it (only) when they do consult it; I do not thereby deny, that all are actually enlightened by it.* I have shewed already why this will not cover him; for I have not only denied, that all men do in some measure consult the Divine Light, but have proved it out ~~of~~ *Rom. 3.* from the state of man in the degeneracy; therefore if none are ~~actually~~ enlightened by it, but when they consult it; then be sure all are not ~~actually~~ enlightened by it, according to his Principle, because there are many that do not attend to it and consult it. But according to the *Quakers* Principle of the Light, which they believe to be Grace and Truth come by Christ Jesus, universally extended to all mankind; the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the World, in the Day and time of his Visitation, wherein he may be saved; It is manifest they believe all are in some measure actually enlightened by it; insomuch that considering man in his fallen and degenerate, and dead estate; it was impossible for him to live, and return to God, till first quickened, and enlightened by him; I hope by this I have sufficiently manifested J. N's contradiction; and that all things are not uniform and consistant as he would have them thought to be.

The next thing I have to take notice of, is J. N's answer to my objection upon his *5th Article*; He tells me he cannot but admire at the singular happiness of my Fancy, in making his *fifth Article* to be the same in substance with the first. But I have more cause to admire his disingenuity in stating it a

new, with additional words, no where exprest in the said 5th Article, to which he assigns it; which having obtruded, he makes use of them not only to invalidate my Charge, but to subject me under an opposition to sound and approved Doctrine, delivered by R. B. and G. K. as likewise to a contradiction of my self, as by what follows may appear.

But first let it be considered why he admires my Fancy, it is this, in his first Article he represents the *Quakers* to make the Light within a *divine communication and manifestation (only;)* This I have shewed elsewhere to be the effect, of some cause; and not the cause or principle the Light its self; therefore not the *Quakers* Faith, but J. N's presumption; In his 5th Article he makes them to understand by this Light within, some determinate formid dictate or proposition; expressly and positively directing and instructing them to do so or so: Now this determinate formid dictate or proposition, &c. is not the Light it self, but the effect of the Light, whether it be outwardly written, as are the holy Scriptures; or inwardly written in the Mind or Understanding; both which may, and do remain when the Divine Light, the blessed Author thereof is clouded as to man, and obscured; this is generally experienced, more especially in the Hearts of the Wicked and Rebellious: And so it differs from being only a divine communication and manifestation. Thus the *Quakers* distinguish concerning the Divine Light; That it is the Author of their divine knowledge, and not the knowledge it self strictly speaking; Upon which reason and consideration, I have opposed the *Quakers* belief of the Light to his definition of it, viz. I say that it is God's divine Oracle of Wisdom in the Soul; the former, dictator and determiner of heavenly Propositions there; as the Original cause of the knowledge and love of Truth, which are its proper effects.

Next, that I may shew how unfairly J. N. deals, in obtruding additional words to his 5th Article, to render me as before, in opposition to my Friends, and contradictory to my self; let it be considered that he asserts, that in his 5th Article it is said, *That the Quakers by their* pag. (96.) *Light within, (that is a directive) understands some determinate formid dictate or proposition, expressly and positively directing, and instructing them to do so or so:* Now these words (*That is a directive*) is not in his said Article, nor in any other of his Articles, by the help of which words, he varies from the point in question, and transfers the subject, from making the Light it self to be some determinate, formid dictate or proposition, &c. to make the direction of the Light; or the Light as directive; which is all one to consist in dictates, or propositions, ready formed, and presented to the view of the Soul, whereby she is formally taught and instructed; by which it is manifest, he hath subtilly changed and altered the subject; therefore he injuriously applies his Consequence, in these following words,

But now, says J. N. are these two the same? if they are, so are a Square and a Circle, Mr. Vickris and my self, Quakerism and Primitive Christianity.

This is a sort of Arguing to be allowed in one that would be thought a Philosopher; pursuant to this J. N. again alters the words, and sence of my Query, designedly no doubt, to render me as he hath done, inconsistent with my self, and my Friends; His words are these, *But he demands of me where I learnt this Account of the Quakers* pag. (96.) *Faith and Doctrine of the Light within, viz. That they represent its direction, by a determinate formid dictate or proposition.* These last words or last sentance is none of mine, but his own; And obtruded upon me, nor do they at all explain my question, but contain new and different matter; my question relates to his making the *Quakers* to understand their Light within in its self, to be some determinate, formid dictate or proposition; and not the direction of the Light; in which latter sence he states the question in my Name; and then makes his answer, quoting divers passages out of R. B's *Apollogy*, and G. K's *Way to the City of God*; and at last my own words to, to no other purpose but to fence against what pag. (97. 98.) he wrongfully says I query; and not what I really query myself: And so I having discovered his foundation herein to be presumptive and false, his whole superstructure falls to the ground, and makes nothing against me; but discovers his own weakness and unfairness: If after all this he sees not a difference betwixt making the Divine Light within, the Oracle of divine Wisdom in the Soul, the former, dictator and determiner of heavenly propositions there, and the dictates and propositions themselves when so formed; I may safely say he is not fit to be esteemed a Philosopher; but I presume he does, and therefore think the worse of him, for his disingenuous treatment upon the point.

In his 5th Article I observe that J. N. says, *That my Light is only the essential Truth of God, which indeed is always present to my Understanding, and intimately united with it; but does not formally enlighten or instruct me, but when I attend to it, and consult it; and read what is written in those Ideal Characters.*

To which I answer, To say that the Light (supposing it to be what really it is, viz. a distinct Principle from the Soul) is always present to the understanding, which implys its operation upon the natural capacity, or organ, the ordinary means of knowing; I conceive is more then can be safely or experimentally said; because the Organ may be hurt, and the understanding in that sence interrupted; and consequently no fit Medium, either for the Soul or its Light; besides the Soul may be absent from the natural Understanding, by the interposition of Spiritual, as well as Natural Causes; yet present with the Light in its spiritual way of pag. (100.) understanding. This he says has no force against him; but I presume it has; and he gives this Reason, That tho' he supposes the Light always

always present to the understanding, the bare presence of the Light does not infer its actual operation on the Soul, which he apprehends is the *Quakers* Principle; but denies it to be his; but to illustrate this matter, and to make this mistake appear, we must distinguish betwixt the Soul, and the natural Understanding; I grant if J. N. had said my Light is always present to my Soul, it would not thence infer its actual operation always on his understanding; but so far as he says, *my Light is always present to my Understanding, and intimately united with it*; it does necessarily imply its operation always on his Soul, because the Understanding is not capable of its reception and presence; but as it is manifested by the Soul, through the operation of the Light in it, and through it, as in a glass; consequently the Divine Light cannot be always present to the Understanding, and intimately united with it, but it must first excite its self, and operate in the Soul. Thus I have proved his assertion, in his *9th Article*, plainly and necessarily to imply what he disowns; since, *viz.* That the presence of the divine Light in the Understanding does infer its actual operation on the Soul; and if it be as he says, always present in the understanding; then 'tis always actual in the Soul, which brings him confessedly guilty of Contradiction; and I profess I see not how he can escape it: But now as to the Contradiction, Confusion and Inconsistency he would fasten upon me, in which he is so confident, that if it be not, he will never pretend to judge of a Contradiction again; He grounds it upon my saying, that this divine Light is always in some degree and measure present in the Soul, the *Quakers* believe; This he says plainly contradicts what I said before, that the Light does not always operate upon the Understanding. Now though I say the Light is always present, &c. in the Soul; I do not say, neither does it follow, that the presence does necessarily infer its operation upon the understanding at all times, Neither is that the *Quakers* Principle, Nor do I say any where, as my Adversary does; it is always present to the understanding; for that would be equally untrue, and unsound with himself; consequently, I say not that it always operates therein; as *John Norris* does represent me to contradict my self; seeing in my Objections to him I make it unsafe so to say, for the Reasons I have therein given; but assert the contrary, *viz.* That the Soul may be absent from the Natural Understanding, by the interposition of Spiritual as well as Natural Causes, yet present with the Light in its spiritual way of understanding.

Thus J. N. abuses my Words and Sense, where I say this divine Light is always in some degree and measure present in the Soul; he says it contradicts what I laid down before, *viz.* That the Light does not always operate upon the Understanding, &c. I never said before it did, I only opposed his Notion as not safe, *viz.* That the Light was always present with his Understanding, and intimately united with it; objecting that this necessarily implied its actual operation upon the understanding; which to say as I do, the Light is always in some degree

gree and measure present in the Soul, does not so imply, nor necessarily infer its actual operation therein, at all times : Therefore his Consequence on me vanishes ; and his own Assertion, viz. *That his Light is always present to his Understanding, and intimately united with it, and yet that it does not formally enlighten or instruct it, but when attended to and consulted ;* carries a Contradiction in it self ; besides I shew how he mistakes the nature of intimate Union, which he places in the Understanding ; whilst it is in the dark, and void of actual Illumination, or attending to, and consulting the divine Light ; consequently without partaking of its Nature and Influences ; which as I said is the Reason and manner of its union, whence I conclude in opposition to his Notion of intimate Union ; That if the Understanding be not enlightened, and instructed, but when it attends to, and consults the divine Light, then surely it cannot be intimately united unto the Divine Light until it has so done ; for till then according to him, the understanding must be altogether in darkness ; and what fellowship or union hath Light with Darkness, or Christ with Belial.

The next thing J. N. objects to is, *That those Texts of Scripture, which he says I insist upon to prove our Illumination is not by attention, because the Grace of God prevents mans turning to him ; is short of what I deduce in many words.* pag. (101.)

Answer ; I no where say that we are in no wise Illuminated by attention ; neither does it follow from the Grace of God ; preventing or coming before mans turning to him ; that man is not more illuminated by his turning, and attention ; all that I say is that these and many other Texts abundantly prove ; that God quickens and enlightens man, before man can turn unto him, *John 5. 21. and Ephes. 2. 1, 4, 5. You hath he quickened who were dead in Trespasses and Sins : But God who is rich in Mercy, for his great Love, wherewith he hath loved us, even when we were dead, hath quickned us together in Christ ; by Grace ye are saved, 2 Cor. 4. 6. God who commanded Light to shine out of Darkness, hath shined in our Hearts, to give us the Light of the knowledge of of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, Pet. 4. 6. For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be Judged according to men in the Flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit.*

J. N. objects, *That there is no force in the Argument ; for that the word Turning is equivocal, & may signifie either the Moral conversion of the will to Holiness, and Righteousness, which is the Fruit of true Illumination ; or that simple conversion of the understanding to the Light of God, which is the cause of it ; If the former, then I grant that the Grace of God does enlighten, before man can turn to him ; that is a man is first enlightned before he is converted ; But if the latter, I deny that God does enlighten man, before man turns to him ; Nor does the Text cited by him prove it.* Thus far J. N. pag. 102.

This last Conclusion is positive, and plainly denotes the difference betwixt us, from whence he makes this Doctrine to Result ; viz. Man must first convert himself to the Divine Light, and attend to it, before he can be enlightned by it. To which I answer, Man as considered in the fallen state of the first *Adam*, is degenerated, blind and dead, in that estate unable of himself to do any thing acceptable to God ; neither can he enter into the way of Holiness, or convert himself unto the divine Light, and attend to it, till he be first quickened, and have the Eyes of his Understanding some way opened, by the Light, and Spirit of Truth ; and feel some secret touches of divine Influence & Virtue, from the Light, to enable him to convert, and turn his mind unto it ; for how can a Man enter into a Way, while he is blind and knows nothing thereof ; so that the Soul's converting it self, is through the Lord's converting it ; by quickening and enlightening it in some measure, to see, and feel him in his divine and gracious visits, and touches of the Soul ; whereby it suffers it self to be turned to the Lord, according to these words in the Scripture, *Jer. 31. 18. Turn thou me, and I shall be turned :* And this J. N. does in effect grant me ; where he says on this wise, *Nor is it any derogation to the Grace of God, to say, that Attention is a prerequisite condition to farther Illumination, because it is by the Grace of God ; Man is first moved, and enabled to attend ; So that attention being the application of the Eye of the Mind ; It is plain that the Eye must be first opened,*

opened, before it can be applied, in order to a further Illumination. So that if J. N. makes it the Light of Attention, it is all one; I shall not differ with him about Terms, since we agree that it is necessary to attend to the Divine Light, in order as I said before to experience more of its Illumination; and that the Divine Light doth first engage, and excite man to this attention; whether he will allow this ability of attention to proceed from any degree of actual Illumination, or not, I shall not much concern myself; being satisfied in the Reason, Nature, and order of things it must be so.

Lastly, I charge him in his 6th Article with great and general Reflections on the Quakers, without offering any Proof, or Reducing them to a particular Charge, in saying, *They do not offer any Rational or Intelligible account of their Light within, neither as to the Thing, nor as to Manner*; which is not true; This villifies the Quakers; but proves nothing against them; his own quotations out of their Writings, laying aside his unjust Inferences, disproves him in this particular. Again he says, *They Caut about some loose and general Expressions about the Light*; Here he derides the Holy Ghost's Stile, and Language in the Quakers mouths; which favours of Prophaneness; which he says they confirm with the Authority of *S. John's Gospel*; I say, if they so confirm them, it argues they agree to what is there taught; (it is therefore so much the worse in *J. N.* to account them loose and canting) Though he says the Quakers understand neither one nor the other; which I tell him is an evil Presumption, concerning many thousands he knows not: But what does *J. N.* say to all this; He tells me he doubts not but he shall be able to make his Words good, by shewing the Quakers notion of the Light to be indeed Unprincipled, and Unphilosophical. Unprincipled I am sure he never can, if he means by Unphilosophical, that they deliver their Faith and Doctrine of the Light, in Scripture Terms, and confirm them according to the Authority of *S. John's Gospel*; and not according to his new way of explaining his Notion; viz. Omniformity of the Ideal world, or the like; I must tell him plainly, whatever esteem he has for them; we affect the good Apostolical Terms, and Language taught us in the Holy Scriptures, and given forth by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, much better; And though *J. N.* is pleased to make a pleasant Fancy about the Word Confirm, as though I claimed more by it, than what he thinks fit to allow us; Let him intend more or less what he will, that he makes use of the Word in the same sense I have taken it; is manifest, pag. (60.) and I am sure the Quakers Expressions about the Light, are agreeable to what is taught in *John's Gospel*: His general Charge of the Quakers Notion of the Light as Unprincipled, and Unphilosophical, being as *J. N.* says such as concerns the intire Body of their Hypothesis, concerning the Light.

And so I shall content my self at present, in having thus largely treated of the Quakers Principle of the Divine Light within, and shewed it to be Christ Jesus the heavenly Man, or Lord from Heaven, the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace, and full of Truth, in opposition to any Created or Material Substance whatsoever, most Injuriously charged upon the Quakers, as deducible from their Writings; which is an old Scotch, Presbyterian Calumny, newly taken up by *J. N.* whose gross treatment of the Quakers, in perverting and misapplying their Words and Sense, is hereina largely discovered; whereby my Charge against him in my Just Reprehension is not only vindicated, but the like Abuses in his Appendix, being exactly of a piece with this which I have now answered, may be the easier seen through and discerned, to which end I recommend what I have written to the Consciences of the sober Readers, and Conclude with desire that like Noble Bereans, they may search and try whether things are so or no.

THE END.